DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 655 EA 017 235

AUTHOR	Zerchykov, Ross, Comp.
TITLE	A Citizen's Notebook for Effective Schools.
INSTITUTION	Institute for Responsive Education, Boston, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	373p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Sales, Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 ($13.00 prepaid or P.O.; $.50 for handling will be billed on non-prepaid orders; Deluxe edition with 3-ring binder, $20.00).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC15 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizen Participation; Community Involvement; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Sources; Parent Materials; *Program Effectiveness; Research Utilization; *Resource Materials; School Community Relationship; *School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This document is a loose-leaf collection of materials intended to help citizens become active in working to make schools more effective. Its organization and contents are geared to three kinds of information needs. Part A provides research evidence on what works in instruction. It includes (1) a summary of the "Effective Schools" research, (2) a discussion of its implications for citizen participation, (3) 15 concise fact sheets on how school practices relate to student achievement, and (4) research briefs on 41 major studies of effective school improvement. Part B provides examples, in the form of "practice profiles" describing 47 local school improvement projects in 36 communities in 21 states. Part C catalogs three kinds of resources: (1) reading lists that describe available guides and materials; (2) a census and summary of assistance and information from 30 community education centers; and (3) one-page resource abstracts for each of 13 organizations and more than 50 resource people nationwide. Topical and geographic indexes are included, followed by two appendixes. One provides specific answers to questions on "how to measure your school's effectiveness," and the other provides resource briefs and samples of effective practices at the high school level. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249655

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. De Carlo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

compiled by Ross Zerchykov

foreword by Don Davies

contributions by: Karl Clauset, Rachel DeCarlo, Judith Frederick, Owen Heleen, Robin Walden

Institute for Responsive Education
605 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-3309

1984

EA 017 235

Made possible by support from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

INTRODUCTION AND USER'S GUIDE 2

A NOTE ABOUT SOURCES 5

LIST OF PUBLISHERS AND INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORS 7

PART A: THE ISSUES AND THE EVIDENCE 11

- A1: What Is School Effectiveness and What Makes It Different? 11
  - Reading List No. 1 21
  - Reading List No. 2 23
- A2: What Can Citizens Do? 25
  - Reading List No. 3 33
- A3: Evidence: Fifteen Fact Sheets On What Makes A Difference 35
- A4: Research That Has Made A Difference: Forty-One Research Briefs 73

PART B: THE PRACTICES: A SAMPLER OF LOCAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS 157

- Reading List No. 4 253

PART C: RESOURCES 255

- C1: Readings: Guides for Parents and School Practitioners 255
  - Reading List No. 5 257
  - Reading List No. 6 259
- C2: Community Education Assistance Centers . . . 261
- C3: Organizations: Thirteen Organizations Which Provide Service 283
- C4: People: Fifty-five People Who Can Help . . 311

TOPICAL INDEX 423

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX 435

APPENDIX A: HOW TO MEASURE YOUR SCHOOL'S EFFECTIVENESS 443

Reading List No. 7 451

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL: A SAMPLER OF PRACTICES IN TWELVE SCHOOL DISTRICTS . . 453

ABOUT IRE AND ITS PUBLICATIONS 499

FOREWORD

by

Don Davies

There are several things I want to say about the Citizen's Notebook as the administrative head of the sponsoring organization, the Institute for Responsive Education (IRE).

A few years ago, a parent activist with whom IRE works made the following statement:

> "We have this wonderful, active school advisory council. We do lots of things and are written up as a model, but little that we do has anything to do with what the children are learning or not learning."

About the same time, another activist said, "We stimulated a great deal of parent activity. It's very nice, but it's Mickey Mouse, not hooked into the guts of the school program." These kinds of concerns -- expressed in varying ways by different people -- led us to think about how to focus more of our energies on channeling citizen action in education more to the "guts of the school program," to "what children learn or don't learn."

Two major organizational priorities grew out of this thinking: First, an emphasis on coproduction -- how families can contribute directly to helping their own children learn things that are important academically and socially. And, second, an emphasis on encouraging parent and citizen participation in the school effectiveness movement.

This latter emphasis, supported now for several years by grants to IRE from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, led to this publication, A Citizen's Notebook on School Effectiveness. While working on this project, we have had much help from others, especially from colleagues in California, Florida and South Carolina, and from the more than 300 people who participated in our conference on "Citizen Participation and School Improvement" in St. Louis in March 1982.

As I see it, the school effectiveness emphasis was and is a good and appropriate one for IRE. Why? School effectiveness has at its core goals of social justice and equity. It is focused on increasing the achievement of children who are least well-served by the public schools -- children who are poor, black, Hispanic, or of other minority or immigrant groups. A concern for social justice and educational equity were strong motivation for the formation of IRE in 1973, and have provided a continuing framework for its efforts since.

The effectiveness movement has a research base with a pragmatic bent -- focusing on conditions in schools that people can actually change. IRE, from its founding, has tried to promote the integration of theory and practice. We try (even if not always successfully) to reject folklore as a substitute for evidence, even when such rejection diminishes the drama of our advocacy, or puts us in opposition to fellow advocates. We also try to emphasize what can be done rather than to dwell at great length on societal conditions beyond the reach of those working to improve schools.

The school effectiveness movement gives, at least in its theory, a strong place to parent involvement and to citizen participation to build community support. Parent involvement in things that matter about education and citizen participation to influence educational policies are IRE's reason for being. Three features of the Notebook make it useful and different from many other publications. First, the resources -- materials, organizations and people -- are a result of an extensive survey effort that solicited nominations of materials and people who have been helpful to practitioners in school effectiveness efforts. These "things" and people listed are "user-nominated" and "field-tested."

Second, we list 56 individuals who were nominated as helpful consultants. These people, who we are calling IRE Associates, have agreed to be available to speak, and to provide technical assistance and consultant services of varying kinds. What they are aready to do and under what conditions, and on what topics, is specified in the listings. These people are a living resource available to users of the Citizen's Notebook.

Third, the Notebook is unfinished. It is a looseleaf publication, which signals that the topic has an ongoing history and that no book can capture all that it should at any given point. The efforts to make schools more instructionally effective are only beginning. The Notebook, then, invites users to add to it as they use it.

Furthermore, all that is in the Notebook will be maintained and updated in IRE's computer file. We will continuously add names of resource organizations and Field Associates, and continue to do new research briefs. Hence, we invite all users of the Notebook to send us information about projects and to send in nominations of research studies, how-to materials, organizations, and consultants that have been helpful to those involved in efforts to make schools more instructionally effective. An updated Notebook will be provided to those who participate in our next scheduled national conference in April of 1985.

The Notebook is important and useful, I believe, for other reasons. The authors do not add "parent involvement" or citizen participation to the list of school conditions which various studies have shown to be correlated with schools which are effective for poor and minority children. As advocates of participation, we are tempted to do so, but this would run counter to the evidence. It appears that there are "ineffective" schools with large amounts of parent involvement, just as there are effective ones. The significance of parent and citizen participation in school effectiveness has to be thought of in different ways. Some key points, which are included in the pages which follow, are these: Creating the conditions which appear to be correlated with school effectiveness requires politically difficult decisions and actions (e.g., closer administrator supervision to assure time-on-task or increased emphasis on testing and using the results to change instruction). In most communities, such decisions and actions will require the support of a winning coalition on the school board and among the constituents involved in school politics. In addition, parent and citizen participation can help to give the public school as an institution and the decisions it makes credibility among its taxpaying constituents. Such institutional credibility, while not a correlate of instructional effectiveness, can be crucial to the school system's capacity to gain adequate financial and public support for its operations. And, of course, parents (and other citizens) can provide direct resources for instruction (e.g., volunteer tutors, homework hotlines, home tutoring).

While reviewing and emphasizing the research base of the school effectiveness movement, we do not treat the research, the movement, or its progenitors as either sacred or infallible. Hence, we present a summary of the substantive and methodological Achilles' heels of the main school effectiveness models. We review some of the major critiques and, out of that brief discussion, fashion a set of ideas about what citizens and parents _can_ do.

I also want to remind the users of the _Notebook_ that parent and citizen participation in the schools does not have to be justified on the basis of its contributions to pupil achievement. Participation is an inalienable right in a democratic society and should not be held to any "pragmatic test."

Whether their reasons be philosophic or pragmatic, parents and citizens _should_ be and _can_ be significantly involved in school affairs -- from decisionmaking to exchanging information to giving support, especially in those efforts which are designed to make schools more instructionally effective for _all_ children.

I think the _Notebook_ is needed because the evidence to date -- based on our own surveys and the observations of others -- shows that parents and citizens are not very much involved in most school effectiveness projects. There are some significant exceptions, which are noted later. But, most educators appear to be proceeding as if school effectiveness is an in-house, professional/technical effort in which the traditions of minimal, strictly-limited participation by outsiders prevails.

I think the Notebook is needed, as well, because it places strong emphasis on the goal of achieving instructional effectiveness for poor and minority children -- on the equity concerns that prompted this particular movement in the first place. It appears to me that much activity occurring under the label of "school effectiveness" or "school improvement" is simply skirting this difficult issue. In few cases are efforts being made to look separately at achievement data for poor and minority children as contrasted to middle-class children. Few efforts appear to be made to link the results of testing individual low-income and minority children to revised instructional procedures for these children (another root idea of Ron Edmonds and other originators of the school effectiveness movement).

I hope that many will want to use this Notebook to try to correct these two deficiencies in many existing and proposed school effectiveness efforts: Little meaningful parent and citizen participation and inadequate attention to separately measuring the achievement of low-income and minority children and insisting on changing instruction because of clues derived from the achievement measuares that are employed.

I have one final point. This publication is sent forth in the midst of a substantial national discussion about educational excellence. In the next section, the authors compare and contrast school reform under the "excellence" label and school reform under the "school effectiveness" banner. I point to this comparative effort because I am concerned that the goals of social justice and equity not be lost in the national enthusiasms for "excellence." Parent and citizen activists can contribute importantly if they press both political leaders and educators to recognize that excellence for the "best and brightest" at the cost of continued progress toward equality is undesirable and unjust.

I am just immodest enough to believe that the Citizen's Notebook can help parents and citizens in this and many other important ways. We invite the response and further contributions of both citizens and their educator allies in efforts to help American education come closer to its highest aspirations for quality, productivity, and equity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Primary responsibility for compiling this Notebook lay with Ross Zerchykov, Research Director at the Institute for Responsive Education (IRE), who is also principal author of "Part A: The Issues and the Evidence."

With much patience, IRE's Office Manager, W. Dana Rudolph, performed the draft and final production typing. Earlier drafts for some of the materials were typed by Carol Ribadeneyra.

Owen Heleen, now a freelance writer and formerly (1980-83) Associate Editor and Clearinghouse Coordinator for IRE, did the copy editing and proofreading. He is also a contributing author of Part B.

Rachel DeCarlo, IRE's Clearinghouse Director in 1983-84, produced many of the project profiles in Part B, and is principal author of the resource abstracts in Part C.

Robin Walden, a graduate student in the Educational Leadership Program at Boston University's School of Education, did much of the bibliographic research and is a contributing author to the Research Briefs in Part A4 and in Appendix B.

Appendix A, which instructs parents and citizens how to make sense out of pupil achievement test data, was prepared especially for this Notebook by Karl Clauset and Judith Frederick. Clauset is a Research Associate at Boston University and a part-time Research Associate for IRE in the areas of school effectiveness and computer-based clearinghouses. Judith Frederick, Principal of Hammond Elementary School in Wareham (Massachusetts), is currently a doctoral student at Boston University and is involved in a research project comparing different ways of measuring schools' effectiveness.

We also got a lot of outside help in our two-year long process of gathering information for this Notebook.

For many years, now, IRE's work on citizen participation and school improvement has been conducted in partnership with state level citizens' organizations in California, Florida and South Carolina. The following organizations and individuals have been instrumental in identifying issues, projects and resources that have gone into this Notebook: In California,, IPEN -- Information Project on Education: Network, Jackie Berman, Janet Chrispeels, Roberta Hollimon, and many others; the Florida Education Council, Marshall Harris, Wray Register, Bill Gene Smith, and many others; and in South Carolina, the Citizens Coalition for South Carolina Public Schools, the School Advisory Council Assistance Project, and the Governor's Task Force on Citizen Participation, and Sarah Fox, Joy Sovde, Hayes Mizell, Mary Jackson, Ann Riley, and Sam Drew.

Finally, we wish to thank the more than 150 individuals, too numerous to list here, from more than 100 communities in 39 different states, who have responded to our various surveys of practices and projects, organizations, and resources. Their responses made possible the content of much of this Notebook. And, indeed, in many cases, people responding to our queries identified other practices, materials, and people we would otherwise have missed.

INTRODUCTION AND USER'S GUIDE

This Notebook is a collection of materials intended to help citizens who are about to become active (or more active) in working to make their schools more effective for all children. Its organization and contents are geared to three kinds of information needs facing such activists: the need to know about the research evidence on what works in instruction; the need to have examples of school improvement efforts which translate the lessons of the research into practice; and the need for resources in the form of materials and how-to guides and organizations and people with experience and skills in school improvement.

Part A deals with the evidence. Its contents include:

-- A summary of the "Effective Schools" research initiated by the late Ron Edmonds and continued by his colleagues (Part A1) and a discussion of its implications for citizen participation (Part A2).

-- Fifteen concise one to three page "Fact Sheets" which summarize the research evidence on what school practices make a difference for pupil academic achievement (Part A3).

-- One page "Research Briefs" on 41 major studies which make up the knowledge base for "what works" in school improvement (Part A4).

Part B provides examples. It contains "Practices Profiles" which consist of one page summary descriptions of 47 local school improvement projects in 36 communities in 21 states.

Part C catalogs three kinds of resources, or sources of help. Its contents include:

-- "Reading Lists" which describe user-nominated how-to materials and guides and provide information about how to obtain them.

-- A census and summary of assistance and information available from 30 community education centers in 22 states (Part C2).

-- One-page "Resource Abstracts" for each of 13 organizations (Part C3) and 56 resource people (Part C4) from 48 communities, in 27 states, which have agreed to be listed in this Notebook as part of a nationwide resource support network for those working on school improvement.

These fifteen "Fact Sheets," forty-one "Research Briefs," forty-seven "Practices Profiles," and sixty-nine "Resource Abstracts" constitute the core of our Notebook. They are also designed and formatted to be the movable parts of the Notebook. Each can stand alone as a separate handout. They can be moved and re-assembled to provide packets of different kinds of information about research evidence, examples of practices, and resources on a specific topic.

The key to using this Notebook is the topical index. Here is how it works.

Suppose a potential reader were involved in a public policy discussion of a school improvement planning effort, and the discussion focused on the role of the principal. Turning to the topical index entry for "principals," our reader would be directed to the entry for "instructional leadership." That entry references the following items:

Part A3: Fact Sheet No. 10

Part A4: Research Brief No.'s 1-2, 8, 10, 12-14, 19, 22, 31-32, 41

Part B: Practices Profile No.'s 1, 10-14, 16-18, 21, 24-26, 29, 32-33, 35, 41-42, 44, 46

Part C2: Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 4, 9, 10, 13

Part C4: Resource People Abstract No.'s 4, 12-14, 16-17, 21-23, 25-26, 29, 32, 36-38, 42, 43-47, 51-52, 55

The topic index indicates the page number for the beginning of each subsection. Within those subsections each page is identified by a descriptor, e.g., "Fact Sheet No. 10," on the top right hand corner of the page.

Flipping through this Notebook, our hypothetical reader would, by following the topical index reference, be able to find and pull out and re-assemble a packet of information on "principals as instructional leaders" which would consist of:

- a 3-page summary of the research evidence on principals' roles,
- 1-page summaries of 13 research studies which deal with that topic,
- 1-page descriptions of 22 local projects addressing themselves to principals' leadership, and
- 1-page descriptions of four organizations and 26 resource people who can offer help in leadership development.

Similar kinds of combinations of hand-out materials on research evidence, practices and resources can be constructed for the other 44 issues defined in the topical index.

This Notebook also has a geographical index. This is designed to promote networking and to direct readers to the next locally available resources -- another project, an organization, a technical assistance center, or a resource person.

Appendix A provides a specific, hands-on type of answer to questions of what citizens can do. It describes a procedure for analyzing achievement test data in order to identify whether your school is effective for all children.

As noted in the Foreword, the focus is on the elementary level. But in the course of information gathering, we identified and collected some materials which try to extend the knowledge and practices about school effectiveness at the elementary level to the high school. Those materials are presented in Appendix B.

A NOTE ABOUT SOURCES

As is often the case with a new and rapidly evolving set of practices, much of the literature on effective schools is not commercially published and as such is not generally available in bookstores or on the shelves of municipal libraries.

DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE FROM THE SOURCE

Many such documents which are not strictly speaking either books or journal articles are available from the organizations which produced them. A list -- with names and addresses -- of organizations which are the source of non-commercially produced materials is on the following page.

ABOUT ERIC

In many cases, readers will find a citation ending with the letters "ED", followed by a six digit number. This is an ERIC catalog number for that document. ERIC stands for the Educational Resource Information Center, run by the U,.S. Department of Education. ERIC is much like a very large mail-order bookstore which collects and disseminates hard-to-get, unpublished, but often very useful documents -- ranging from seminar papers and speeches to project reports, to book-length documents.

Copies of materials referenced with an "ED" number may be obtained from:

Document Reproduction Center
Post Office Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210
(703) 841-1212

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Both major and minor (i.e., narrowly focused, special "trade" and professional) journals are represented in the works cited in the body of this Notebook. Some of the minor journals may be hard to obtain, even through inter-library loan. There are three sources for reprints of journal articles:

(1) University Microfilms International
(Article Reprint Service)
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

(2) Institute for Scientific Information
Original Article Tear Sheet Service
325 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
(800) 523-1850

(3) San Mateo County Educational Resources Center
(SMERC)
333 Main Street
Redwood City, California 94036
(415) 364-5600, Ext. 4404

INSTITUTE FOR RESPONSIVE EDUCATION

Some truly "fugitive" -- unpublished, uncopyrighted documents, not in ERIC -- are available from our own Clearinghouse, which, as a result of this Notebook, stocks fugitive materials on topics relating to citizen participation in schools. Items available from the IRE Clearinghouse are indicated by an asterisk at the end of the citation. Cost is 10 cents per page for reproduction, postage and handling.

LIST OF PUBLISHERS AND INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORS

ALLYN AND BACON
Esquire, Inc.
7 Weils Avenue
Newton, Massachusetts 02159

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
225 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22091

BASIC BOOKS
10 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10002

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Post Office Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

CENTER FOR EARLY ADOLESCENCE
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Suite 233
Call Mill Mall
Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND MANAGEMENT
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(503) 686-5173

CENTER FOR LAW AND EDUCATION
6 Appian Way, Gutman Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

COUNCIL FOR BASIC EDUCATION
725 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

EDUCATION USA
National School Public Relations Association
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS REPORT
Grand Central Station
Post Office Box 2038
New York, New York 10163

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION
Teachers College, Columbia University
Box 40
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

THE HURON INSTITUTE
123 Mount Auburn Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

IPEN (INFORMATION PROJECT ON EDUCATION: NETWORK)
810 Miranda Green
Palo Alto, California 94306

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN TEACHING (IRT)
418 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
Center for Social Organization of Schools
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

LEXINGTON BOOKS
D.C. Heath and Co.
125 Spring Street
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173

McCUTCHAN PUBLISHING CORPORATION
2525 Grove Street
Berkeley, California 94704

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION (NCCE)
410 Wilde Lake Village Green
Columbia, Maryland 21044

NATIONAL SCHOOL PUBLIC RELATIONS ASSOCIATION
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

NEWARK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Office of Research and Evaluation
2 Cedar Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Research
Albany, New York 12234

NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LIBRARY
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION RESEARCH
34-F Boone Hall
College of Education
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

PHILADELPHIA SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation
Parkway at 21st Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

THE RAND CORPORATION
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California 90406

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCIL ASSISTANCE PROJECT
Box 51
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

SOUTHEASTERN PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM
Suite 501, 1338 Main Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES
Laboratory in School and Community Education
Graduate School of Education
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

WISCONSIN R & D CENTER
Univrsity of Wisconsin at Madison
1025 W. Johnston Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

PART A1: WHAT IS SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND WHAT MAKES IT DIFFERENT?

WHAT IS SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS?

School effectiveness is a movement for reform based on research that shows what school practices can help to "beat the odds" with respect to pupil achievement and pupil progress towards mastery of basic skills.

The "odds" are simply this. Generally, without intervention, the higher a child's socio-economic status (SES), the higher will be his/her level of readiness, the faster he/she will progress towards mastery of basic skills, and the higher will be his/her level of achievement. In fact, in the grossest statistical sense, the best predictor of pupil achievement level of educational attainment -- the last grade a student successfully completes -- is that pupil's mother's level of attainment.*

HOW DOES A SCHOOL BEAT THE ODDS: AN EFFECTIVE SCHOOL DEFINED

The "odds" whether in gambling games or in statistics and probability apply to "large events," i.e., to large numbers of cases. But, any set of odds can be changed by changing conditions. In an effective school, conditions are such that student achievement data show that "all students evidence an acceptable minimum mastery of those essential basic skills that re prerequisite to success at the next level of schooling."**

This definition requires some comments.

First, local standards and local practices of testing for "prerequisites" define what is "acceptable minimum mastery."

Second, the emphasis is on "all students." In an ideally effective school, a given age cohort would enter first grade (or kindergarten) at different levels of readiness, but by grade four all children in that cohort will exhibit enough mastery to go on to the fifth grade. In the real world, of course, a fraction of that cohort may not at any one point in time have achieved those masteries. Also, above the minimum level, there will be a distribution of achievement scores. In an effective school, it would be impossible to predict levels of mastery and achievement on the basis of pupil socio-economic background, and vice-versa. That is, the distribution of achievement would not mirror the distribution of pupil socio-economic status.

---

* W. Timothy Weaver, The Contest for Educational Resources. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1982, p. 35.

** Lawrence Lezotte, "Effective Schools Research and Its Implications," in Citizen Action in Education IX, No. 2 (June 1982), pp. 1 and 10-11.

The latter is sometimes called the "criterion of proportional mastery." Its sense is contained in some of the earlier definitions which come out of the search for effective schools. Here is a sample:

A school is effective:

"...when the percentage of the highest social class who perform at minimum mastery on standardized tests is equal to the percentage of lowest class children who do the same," and

"...if it brings the children of the poor to the minimum masteries of basic skills that now describe successful pupil performance for children of the middle class."

The above examples of ways of describing "proportional mastery" reveal the strong value base behind the school effectiveness movement.

HOW WERE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS FOUND?

Instructionally effective schools were discovered by research looking for exceptions to the general rule established by large scale social science studies that family SES was the principle cause of differences in pupil achievement, despite the efforts of Great Society initiated compensatory education programs.*

The "effective schools" research is largely a search for exceptions, a search for those schools that "beat the odds." This search for exceptions was undertaken not to disprove the general connection between class and achievement, but to dispel the policy implications which researchers, opinion leaders, and officials were drawing from these findings.

Neo-conservatives citing Coleman's (1966) "Equal Educational Opportunity Survey" study concluded that Great Society equity and compensatory education programs were a bust and that schools could not do any more for the poor. Left-wing radicals, citing the Jencks (1972) "Inequality" study, concluded that schooling doesn't make a real difference anyway. Until society itself became more equal, they contended, efforts to equalize educational opportunity were fruitless.

These opposite poles of the ideological spectrum drew the same general conclusion: Schools don't make much of a difference. This attitude, prevalent in the early to mid-1970's,

---

* See Chart A on the next page summarizing this evidence.

CHART A: SOCIAL CLASS AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT: THE BAD NEWS

Introduction

What follows is a quick summary of the major evidence, current in the early 1970's, which formed the background to the "search for effective schools" movement.

The news came from a variety of sources: from early and, as it turned out, premature evaluations of the impact of Title I and Headstart (summarized in Averch, et al., 1972); James Coleman's (1966) "Equal Educational Opportunity Survey" (EEOS); Christopher Jencks' study, Inequality (1972); and a cross-national study (22 countries including the U.S.) of the correlates of differences in pupil performance (Purves and Levine, 1975).

Findings

> "...school brings little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background" (Coleman, p. 325).

> "...the very lack of an independent effect means that inequalities imposed on children by their home, neighborhood and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities which they confront in adult life after schools" (ibid.).

> "Compensatory education equity programs failed to overcome the family background obstacles of the targeted Title I and Headstart populations" (the Title I and Headstart studies summarized in Averch, et al., 1972).

> "...variations in what children learn in school depend largely on variations in what they bring to school, not on variations in what schools offer them" (Jencks, 1972: 33).

> "Family background was the greatest single cause of variation occurring country to country, school to school, or pupil to pupil" (Purves and Levine, 1975).

> "...even if we reorganized the schools so that their primary concern was for students who most needed help, there is no reason to suppose that adults would end up appreciably more equal as a result" (Jencks, 1972:235).

References

AVERCH, H.A., et al. (1972). How Effective Is Schooling?

Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

COLEMAN, J.S., et al. (1966). Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.

JENCKS, C.S., et al. (1971). Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

PURVES, A.C. and D.U. LEVINE (1975). Educational Policy and International Assessment. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

---

demonstrated a disintegration of the earlier constituency for school reform. More importantly, it signalled an historic retreat from the uniquely American vision and ideal of the "common" public school as a place in which talent and ability, not social status, was nurtured and rewarded, and schools were seen as vehicles for upward social mobility for those who had talent and determination but little means and few connections.

Most importantly, the school effectiveness movement provided data that resurrected the possibility of the American dream of the common school as a vehicle for democracy. It did so by discovering that despite the obvious benefits of class, some schools do make a difference. The effective schools literature then documented what was different about those schools which did make a difference.

This discovery and documentation was made possible by what social science methodologists call a "paradigm shift", a new way of looking at existing evidence and a new way of defining a problem. That is, researchers began asking different kinds of questions abut the data on pupil achievement and about the phenomena of pupil achievement levels and progression in schools.

For example: The "search-for-effective-schools" accepted the fact that class correlates, in the most general sense, with pupil achievement. But is this the result of what lower class pupils are like or is it a result of what schools serving lower class pupils are like? Put another way, the question was: Are class differences in achievement the result of pupil characteristics or of schools' characteristics?

One way to explore this issue is to see if there are any intra-socio-economic group differences in achievement. Are there variations in achievement among those groups who statistically are supposed to have lower achievement? And, if there is any variation, can it be traced to what schools "are like" rather than to what pupils "are like"? One way to find out is to see if there are any schools serving predominantly minority and low-income pupils whose achievement is higher than statistically predicted. (See Reading Lists No. 1 and 2 at the end of this section for references to the studies cited in the discussion which follows.)

This is exactly the question which drove George Weber's (1972) pioneering study of effective city schools. In this study, schools were "effective" because the pupil achievement was at national norms. Weber set out to identify what was common to all four schools, discovering in each case that these schools had strong instructional leadership, high expectations, an orderly climate, a focus on pupil acquisition of basic skills, and a reinforcement of that focus through careful and frequent evaluation of pupil progress.

Weber's study set the model for one approach to the search for effective schools and the conditions for effectiveness. That approach, sometimes called the "outlier" method, looks for outlying statistical exceptions and differentiated them from the rest (see, for example, Brookover and Lezotte, 1979).

A more precise way of addressing the original question -- do lower class children achieve less because of what they are like or because of what the schools that serve them are like -- is to compare schools that serve similar populations but have dissimilar pupil achievement results. This comparative case study approach was first used in the New York State (1974) Office of Education Performance Review Study of two inner-city New York City schools. A more ambitious and rigorous version of this approach was used in a study of 21 pairs of California schools matched on the basis of pupil performance on standardized achievement measures (California, State of, 1977).

Still other studies (Edmonds and Frederickson, 1979; Philadelphia, 1979) used traditional regression analysis in which an array of independent variables were tested to see which made a difference (and how much difference) for the dependable variable: student achievement. In the school effectiveness studies, however, the independent variables focused on were "school effects" -- that is, factors susceptible to change, usually at the school building level.

This approach is characteristic of the paradigm shift made by the school effectiveness researchers. Instead of asking "What are all of the factors that affect pupil achievement and which are statistically the best predictors?", the school effectiveness researchers asked (controlling for factors that we can't do anything about either in the long run or in the short run, e.g., pupil SES, drastic policy changes in class size or in per-pupil expenditures): "What factors under the control of the school staff make a difference for pupil achievement?"

In short, school effectiveness asked, "What is different about successful schools that can be made to be different?"

What unites all of these studies is an inductive approach. Rather than test theory and hypotheses, the studies were characterized by what Larry Lezotte has called a "discovery-oriented research" way of looking at instances of "success in the work-place and then describing what conditions were associated with that success. Elsewhere, Lezotte has explained that this "research approach may be more appropriately described as a series of case studies in which similar information is gathered for each case. The data analysis centers around a search for characteristics common among the effective schools but not shared by the less effective, comparison schools."*

WHAT MAKES EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS DIFFERENT?

The search for effective schools did identify some common characteristics. These are the five well-known correlates of an effective school, including:

(1) STRONG INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP, often on the part of the principal;

(2) An INSTITUTIONAL FOCUS ON BASIC SKILLS acquisition on the part of all pupils;

(3) An orderly, business-like, but not oppressive CLIMATE;

(4) EXPECTATIONS that all pupils can achieve a minimum mastery of basic skills;

(5) The practice of FREQUENTLY MONITORING PUPIL PROGRESS.

These five famous correlates require three comments.

First, researchers do not yet know whether these characteristics are the causes of instructional effectiveness. Correlational research does not easily allow to draw cause-and-effect conclusions. This is especially true in non-theory based, inductive, discovery-oriented research.

Second, it is important not to confuse ends with means. It is not the presence of these five correlates, but rather pupil outcomes that define a school as effective. The five correlates describe practices that are a means to an end. Merely establishing the practices described by the correlates and then documenting changes in school practices does not mean that a school has become an effective school. Only pupil outcome data can establish and document effectiveness.

Three, the five correlates serve as umbrella terms for accumulating evidence about what practices are associated with effective schools. It is these practices that count. There is no particular magic in the terms themselves. In fact, they sound terribly common-sensical. For that very reason, it is tempting, in moving from research to practice, from study to implementation, to load onto those terms one's own intuititions and definitions of what constitutes, for example, "strong instructional leadership on the part of the principal." Once that is done, practice is no longer guided by research. Fact Sheet No.'s 1, 4, 9, 10 and 12 in Part A3, below, provide information on what kinds of concrete behaviors as identified in the research are associated with each correlate.

---

* Lawrence W. Lezotte, "Climate Characteristics in Instructionally Effective Schools," n.d., page 6.

WHAT'S NEXT: AN UNFINISHED AGENDA FOR SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

The school effectiveness research has prompted a reform movement. In a background study completed for the report, A Nation At Risk, researchers found that there are 2,378 schools in 875 districts in 25 states involved in 39 different "school effectiveness programs."* Most of these programs have goals that relate to improving student achievement and behavior to and/or improving the general characteristics of effective schools (leadership, climate, expectations, academic focus, and monitoring achievement). The major components found in these programs include: a process for data collection and feedback, school-wide planning teams and task forces, technical assistance and consultants, intensive staff training, and funding to support the initial development and annual recurring costs.

As of this printing, it is not clear how many of these improvements are guided by rather than simply inspired by the school effectiveness research paradigm. Many projects focus on improving inputs as their goal. Among those focusing on outcomes, some focus on student behavior rather than cognitive outcomes. With respect to cognitive outcomes, it is not clear how many use some version of the proportional mastery criterion as a measure of project success.

Nonetheless, some of these practices may provide fertile ground for further development of the effective schools research model. Ironically, the model's principal strength -- its open minded, atheoretical approach -- is also a weakness, especially when it comes to implementing the implications of the research into practice.

---

* M. Miles, et al., The Extent of Adoption of Effective Schools Programs. Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute, 1983.

What's missing in the current state-of-the-art on school effectiveness is any theory or data about how schools become effective and how they stay effective.

If, as the research suggests, effective schools are systematically different from ineffective schools, then to achieve effectiveness a school has to become different, to change as an organization. Organizational change can be exceedingly complex. It may require policy decisions, and indeed political pressure, from outside of the schools and as such there may be a role for citizen and community involvement in pushing for and nurturing the process by which schools become effective. In Part A3, we discuss what citizens can do in light of recent theory and commentary on school effectiveness as an organizational change process.

EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE: WHAT IS REALLY DIFFERENT ABOUT SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS?

It is interesting that the aforementioned Huron Institute (Miles, et al., op. cit.) survey of school improvement projects was prepared as a background report to the Nation At Risk, the latter being the initial trumpet call of the current campaign of concern about excellence.

There are some similarities between "excellence" and "effectiveness." Each is fundamentally a positive response: despite criticism, each assumes that schools not only should but can do better. Each is concerned with student outcomes. Each has resulted in formulas for increasing schools' productivity, for making them more orderly, business-like, and better focused on academics. Each has faulted past practice for not expecting more learning out of the students.

The concern for excellence, however, has focused on the high school level, while the school effectiveness research has focused on the elementary level. With respect to student outcomes, "effectiveness" focuses on basic skills, usually defined as elementary reading and math. Excellence, on the other hand, focuses on higher-order skills and competencies, and on mastery of curricula above and beyond basic skills and minimum competencies.

Implicit in many of the excellence plans and proposals is a challenge for schools to nurture the "best-and-the-brightest." A school or a schooling system can exhibit excellence -- it can tighten standards, make its curriculum more rigorous, increase its average achievement scores, have its students score higher on SAT's -- and it can still be ineffective for some of its students.

In brief, "effectiveness" has an equity dimension, "excellence" does not.

There is also a difference in the way both movements use data.

School effectiveness is perhaps unique among reform movements in being based on discovery research rather than being based on educational philosophy. It is based on discovery of the facts about what is possible. Excellence is driven by showing a discrepancy between values about what should be, and the facts about what is.

At the level of principle, there is no irreconcilable contradiction between excellence and effectiveness. Each represents a different emphasis on two equally important missions of schools. The contradiction, however, can arise at the level of practice, in designing and implementing school improvement in a world of finite time and resources. At this level, schools and their public may have to choose between, for example, spending more on tutors to help all 3rd graders achieve a minimal mastery in reading and ensuring that all 9th graders become computer literate. The excellence and effectiveness models will give you differing measures of whether your efforts to improve are succeeding.

Ultimately, these tensions will get played out in each community depending on how it chooses to define "improvement" in education.

Two final points, however, need to be made.

One, there is no research knowledge base for assuming that implementing the conditions associated with effective schools will bring about improved student achievement in the higher-order skills.

Two, there is similarly no empirical evidence that implementing the practices called for under the umbrella of excellence reforms will help schools to be instructionally effective for all children.

PART A1 **READING LIST NO. 1**

KEY SOURCES

The "key" sources described here are those original research studies which initiated and have since propelled the school effectiveness movement. They are listed here in alphabetical order. All references are briefed in Part A4, above, hence at the end of the reference we give the corresponding Brief Number.

AZUMI, J. and S. MADHERE (1982). "Characteristics of High Achieving Elementary Schools in Newark." Newark School District Research Report, Office of Research, Evaluation and Testing. ED 217 099. Brief No. 2.

BROOKOVER, W. and L. LEZOTTE (1979). School Characteristics Associated with Changes in Student Achievement. East Lansing: The Institute for Research in Teaching (IRT), Michigan State University. Brief No. 8.

CALIFORNIA, STATE OF (1977). California School Effectiveness Study: The First Year 1974-75. Sacramento, CA: State Department of Education. Brief No. 10.

CLANCY, P.L. (1982). 19 Improving Schools and Why. Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University. Brief No. 12.

EDMONDS, R. and J. FREDERICKSON (1979). Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children. ED 170 396. Brief No. 18

NEW YORK, STATE OF (1974). School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools. Albany, NY: New York State Office of Education. ED 089 211. Brief No. 31.

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS (1979). What Works in Reading? Philadelphia: Office of Research and Evaluation, School District of Philadelphia. Brief No. 32.

RUTTER, M., et al. (1979). Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effect on Children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Brief No. 34.

WEBER, G. (1971). Inner-City Children Can Be Taught To Read: Four Successful Schools. CBE Occasional Papers, No. 18. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education. ED 057 124. Brief No. 41.

COMMENTS ON THE CONCEPT AND SUMMARIES OF THE EVIDENCE

This list includes the most accessible works which comment upon and summarize the school effectiveness research and the school effectiveness movement.

CLAUSET, K.H. and A.K. GAYNOR (1982). "A Systems Perspective on Effective Schools." Educational Leadership (December).

COHEN, M. (1982). "Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings." American Education (January-February).

CUBAN, L. (1983). "Effective Schools: A Friendly But Cautionary Note." Phi Delta Kappan (June).

D'AMICO, J. (1982). "Each Effective School May Be One Of A Kind." Educational Leadership (December).

DUCKWORTH, K. (1981). Linking Educational Policy and Management with Student Achievement. Center for Educational Policy and Management. University of Oregon (September).

GLENN, B.C., et al. (1981). What Works? An Examination of Effective Schools for Poor Black Children. Available from the Center for Law and Education, 6 Appian Way, Gutman Library, Cambridge, MA 02138. ED 216 060.

HUITT, W.G. and J.K. SEGARS (1980). Characterististics of Effective Classrooms. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

LEZOTTE, L.W. (1982). "Effective Schools Research and School Improvement Implications," in Citizen Action in Education, IX, No. 1 (June).

MacKENZIE, D.E. (1983). "Research for School Improvement: An Appraisal of Some Recent Trends," in Educational Researcher (April), pp. 5-17.

PURKEY, S. and M. SMITH. "Too Soon To Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools," in Educational Leadership, December 1982, pp. 64-69.

RALPH, J. and J. FENNESSEY (1983). "Science or Reform: Some

Questions About the Effective Schools Model." Phi Delta Kappan (June).

ROWAN, B., S. BOSSERT and D. DWYER (1983). "Research on Effective Schools: A Cautionary Note," in Educational Researcher (April).

SQUIRES, D.A. (1980). Characteristics of Effective Schools: The Importance of School Progress. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

PART A2: WHAT CAN CITIZENS DO?

INTRODUCTION

Common sense and a growing, indeed definitive body of evidence, can answer the question in a loud affirmative: parents can do a lot to improve the academic performance of their own children.* But that is not the issue addressed here.

The issue is what can parents and citizens do to improve the ability of schools -- which they pay for as taxpayers, and to which some send their children -- to be instructionally effective for all children, and not just the children of active participants. Thus phrased, the issue poses questions for which answers are not so clear cut. We treat the research literature about what conditions make for instructionally effective schools as a potential set of clues on this issue. Hence, readers are advised to read, to "use", this discussion in conjunction with Fact Sheet No. 13, in Part A3, below, and in conjunction with Part A4 which contains one to two page summaries of the studies cited in Fact Sheet No. 13.

WHAT DOES THE EVIDENCE SAY IN GENERAL?

To repeat, the issue is: What can parents and citizens do to increase schools' ability to teach all childern? The issue is not: What can parents do to increase the ability of their own children to learn, and achieve, and excel in school? The kind of evidence needed to settle the issue we are interested in would show, for example, that schools (or school systems) which had more citizen and parent involvement would also be more instructionally effective. Any data showing such a correlation would establish a case for the proposition that parents do make a difference, and would then open up questions about how and why participation makes a difference.

The research evidence is ambiguous. The ambiguity stems not only from the connection between family socio-economic background (SES) an student achievement, but also from the almost equally strong connection between family SES and rates of involvement and participation of all kinds. These connections can be summarized as follows:

---

* A comprehensive summary of that evidence can be found in Ann Henderson, Parent Participation - Student Achievement: The Evidence Grows (1981), from the National Committee for Citizens in Education, 410 Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Maryland 21044

(1) The higher family SES, the higher the level of achievement at the individual pupil level. And, as a corollary, schools which serve a higher proportion of higher SES students have a higher average student achievement profile.

(2) The higher the family SES the greater is the probability that it will engage in all kinds of participation in school affairs. Here, the corollary is: The more high SES families are in a given school district or school attendance area, the greater the likelihood that that district or school will enjoy higher levels of participation.

(3) Because of #2, immediately above, schools and school districts which have higher levels of participation are apt to serve more upper SES families and their children. And, they are also likely to have higher pupil achievement.

In summary, the nexus between class and achievement, and class and levels of participation, makes it extremely difficult to isolate the independent efforts of participation on a school's achievement profile.

We have not been able to find any set of studies which have been able to disentangle the separate effects of "class" and "participation" on schools' achievement profiles.

WHAT DOES THE SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH SAY ABOUT PARTICIPATION?

The school effectiveness research has been especially mindful and rigorous in "controlling" for SES (and other factors not easily arranged by school officials) in its search for what schools are effective, and what factors make them different.

That research effort did not identify "participation" as one of the five key factors associated with effective schools. Any efforts to add "participation" as a sixth factor, no matter how intuitively plausible or politically attractive, are not useful. They represent a weakening of the reform program based on that research, a weakening, which by adding ad-hoc elements to the program, turns it into yet another reform initiative based on a mixture of "fact" and "fancy" -- educational or political philosophy, wishful thinking, and intuitive common sense.

The implications and the limitations of this negative finding can help clarify the central question at issue. Our final answer to the question, "Do parents make a difference?" is "Yes." There is empirical support for the importance of participation in making schools more instructionally effective.

IMPLICATIONS: WHY THE SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH DID NOT FOCUS ON PARTICIPATION

There are three reasons why this was so.

First, the evidence was unclear, contradictory, and ambiguous. The late Ron Edmonds used to tell citizen activist audiences that: There were some effective schools with lots of participation; there were some effective schools with no participation; an there were some ineffective schools with lots of participation.

Second, the practitioners of the classic school effectiveness studies admitted that they failed to differentiate among different kinds of participation. In light of other existing evidence, this was a significant omission.

Wagenaar (1977)* was the only study which we found that: (1) focused on the school's, not on an individual student's profile of achievement, as the "dependent variable," (2) controlled for school population SES, and (3) used different types and indicators (in fact, 29 different empirical measures) for "participation" as the independent variable. Wagenaar found that controlling for SES, some kinds of participation do make a difference (see Fact Sheet No. 13, and Research Brief No. 40, below).

Third, and perhaps most importantly, the school effectiveness research did not find any evidence that participation made a difference, in part because it did not look for it. That is, the focus was solely on "school effects." School effects are those actions, capable of being decided on the school building level, that differentiated effective vs. ineffective schools who were otherwise similar in all other aspects outside of the control of building administrators and staff.

These "other aspects" included resource allocation decisions beyond building level authority (e.g., per pupil expenditure, class size, etc.), and environmental constraints (e.g., pupil characteristics and levels of participation).

EXPLANATIONS: CURRENT THEORIES ABOUT HOW SCHOOLS BECOME EFFECTIVE

We use the term "theory" advisedly. There is, as of yet, no research about how schools become effective. But some current theorizing, based on a close reading and analyis of the school effectiveness data, does begin to suggest what citizens might do.

---

* Cited in Reading List No. 3 at the end of this subsection.

For example, Michael Cohen (1982), after reviewing the research base for the effective schools movement,* cautions that we really don't know what causes what. In fact, Cohen raises the possibility that high pupil achievement may be the cause not the effect of the conditions found to be associated with effective schools. For instance, where pupils are achieving, the school climate is apt to be quiet and orderly. Where pupils are achieving we would also expect teacher expectations to be higher, since they are based on the facts of performance.

The interactive relationships between "causes" and "effects" are explicitly recognized in Clauset and Gaynor's (1982) systems dynamics model of effective schools. That model seeks to clarify and simulate how schools change to become effective. As envisioned in that model, everything does effect everything else. Moreover, school practices, both those that produce effectiveness and ineffectiveness, are reinforcing and self-perpetuating. Success breeds more success, and failure breeds more failure. Hence, acording to the perspective afforded by a systems approach it may well be true that, as Michael Cohen had implied, high achievement causes high teacher expectations, but expectations also influence achievement.

Also, because a systems approach captures and formalizes our deep-seated but often vague intuitions that everything does effect everything else, it points out that when schools change from patterns of ineffectiveness to effectiveness, something has to give. That "something" is a reallocation of resources, specifically, teacher time and attention to low achievers. In a world of finite resources, such allocations may need political, that is, public support and initiative.

Hence, if we understand school effectiveness as a process of organizational change as well as just a matter of improving instructional technology, then there is a role for parent and citizen involvement. Parent and citizen involvement can be seen as part of the supportive or constraining "environment" which influences the behavior of schools as they try to change to become effective.

A useful picture of those environmental factors emerges out of Duckworth's (1981) conceptual framework summarizing our knowledge of school and classroom effectiveness. Although offered as a model to guide "future research on the contribution of school administration to student achievement" (p. 2), the framework is equally rich in its implications for parent and citizen participation.

The framework provides what could be called a production-function model of student achievement. The "product" is the individual pupil's performance. And this product is a function of different kinds and levels of input. The conceptual framework, presented by Duckworth, organizes the evidence on school, classroom, and teacher effectiveness in terms of the following levels:

---

* A listing of all the in-text references which follow can be found in Reading List No. 2, at the end of Part A1, above.

> Level One: How pupils perform depends on a number of factors including pupil motivation, self-esteem, and opportunities to learn.
>
> Level Two: Some of what determines pupil performance can be attributed to what classroom teachers are like, to what they do, and what they are.
>
> Level Three: Part of what teachers do and use is influenced by the support and or direction they get from building-level administrative practices.
>
> Level Four: The extent to which building-level practices which cause teachers to do the "right things" occur is, in part, a function of top district-level administrative policy which allows or induces (via incentives) or impedes those building-level administrative practices which provide teachers with the incentives to do the "right thing."
>
> Level Five: The regulations promulgated by top-level administrators are in part influenced by mandates from local boards of education.
>
> Level Six: Boards are influenced in part by actual or perceived pressure (the law of anticipated reactions) from their constituents, the public who are the primary audience for this Notebook.
>
> Level Seven: The extent to which the "public" pressures the board depends, in part, on the public's level of information about what kinds of policies are most likely to produce the kinds of practices which produce more achievement.

A TYPOLOGY OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Duckworth's conceptual framework helps to direct attention to how decisions at different levels of a school system can either enhance or impede the improvement of student learning.

Let's take an obvious example. It makes no sense to preach that principals should exercise more instructional leadership unless time is provided for principals to visit more classrooms more frequently, provide more clinical supervision, become more involved in planning and ordering curriculum materials, etc. For all this to happen, something else has to give. The principal's job description may have to be rewritten. Other staff may have to assume some of the housekeeping, building-manager duties which take up time that could be spent on instructional leadership. Other people's jobs (and salaries) may thus need to be upgraded. Before long, the domino effects of these decisions reach the level of district policy where resource re-allocation decisions need to be made. Hence, one obvious way that citizens and parents can make a difference is to "lobby" for or support those spending decisions at the district level which make possible the organizational conditions for effectiveness.

But citizens and parents can also play a more direct role, at lower levels of the school system organization. At the most basic level, for example, what parents do individually at home has an obvious impact on pupil motivation. More importantly, for our focus, one of the classroom practices that works is more time-on-task. (See Fact Sheet No. 15, in Part A3, below.) Here, also, preaching to teachers to spend more time with low achievers may be futile when time as a resource is in short supply. Hence, citizens and parents can make a difference by being a resource, either directly aiding instruction or indirectly assisting by taking on non-instructional activities which consume teachers' time.

We could go on giving examples but the main point is two-fold: Participation is not a separate condition or factor for effective schools. Rather, it intersects and interacts with the other five factors common to effective schools. Secondly, there is no one thing or set of practices called "participation." Instead, it is best to think of participation as a continuum of the many different ways in which citizens and parents interact with their schools.

Citizens and parents can relate to schools in one of these ways: as advocates; as decisionmaking partners; and as coproduction partners.

"Advocacy" refers to citizen action that is explicitly political. That is, it refers to activities designed to influence policies -- directives for schools to do something different -- and to make sure that those directives are implemented. Acting as a "watchdog" is an example of this latter kind of activity.

"Decisionmaking" refers to those kinds of activities -- such as serving on policy boards, task forces, and advisory councils and committees of various kinds -- in which citizens help make decisions about the implementation of policy directives and the allocation of resources devoted to school improvement.

"Coproduction" refers to those activities, individual or collective, in-school or at home, which contribute to school efforts to instruct pupils and raise pupil achievement. Such activities include: well-coordinated at-home tutoring programs; home-school communication and parent education designed to make parents more knowledgeable about what schools are trying to teach and how their children are progressing; volunteer activities such as in-school tutoring in basic skills or providing enrichment programs.

In summary, the distinctions among the three types of participation are as follows: "advocacy" seeks to influence or change, and/or support decisions about how a school system's emphasis and resources are re-allocated; "decisionmaking" seeks to influence the implementation of those resource re-allocation decisions; while "coproduction" adds resources to the school system's capacity to improve achievement for all students.

SUMMARY: CITIZENS CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

In a very real sense, the contents of this Notebook provide an extended answer to the original topic question: What can citizens do? For example:

As advocates, citizens can raise the issue of school effectiveness. Appendix A below describes an easy to follow procedure for using existing student achievement data in order to determine whether a school, no matter how high its average achievement scores are, is effective for all children.

As advocates, citizens can also argue the case that school effectiveness is possible with examples drawn from the experience of other school districts. Part B, below, contains one page descriptions of local school improvement practices from around the nation. Citizens can also call upon, or refer their school district officials to, "expert witnesses" -- individuals who have experience in trying to mobilize community energy and support in order to make schools more effective. Part C4, below, describes such resource people who were nominated by those already involved in and working for school improvement efforts.

As advocates and decisionmaking partners, citizens can also express informed opinions about what school practices should be encouraged or supported, at the level of policy, in order to promote instructional effectiveness. Existing research evidence about what "legislatible" practices make a difference is summarized in the fifteen Fact Sheets in Part A3, below.

Fact Sheet No. 13, in that section, which focuses on "participation," suggest what kinds of school-home collaborative coproduction activities have made a difference for low-achieving, low-income pupils.

And, finally, as advocates again, citizens can lobby, encourage, or even take the lead in organizing those co-production type activities which make a difference. This latter type of advocacy may, in fact, be the most powerful of all kinds of citizen action. In conjunction with the school, citizens help to mobilize and create the kind of family support and reinforcement which has always given the children of upper-middle class families a head-start towards mastery of academic skills.

PART A2: PARTICIPATION **READING LIST NO. 3**

PARTICIPATION AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The works below contain findings which show a relationship between citizen and parent participation and schools' effectiveness in instructing all children.

ARMOR, D., et al. (1976). *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools*, Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Prepared for the Los Angeles Unified School District. R-2007-LAUSD.

BARTH, R. (1979). "Home-Based Reinforcement of School Behavior: A Review and Analysis," in *Review of Educational Research* 49, No. 3 (Summer).

BEANE, J.A., R.P. LIPKA and J.W. LUDEWIG (1980). "A Synthesis of Research on Self-Concept." *Educational Leadership* (October).

BOULDER VALLEY (1975). "Personalized Kindergarten Program with Supplementary Parent Involvement: A Final Report." Boulder Valley, Colorado School District. ED 116 791.

BROOKOVER, W. and L. LEZOTTE (1979). *School Characteristics Associated with Changes in Student Achievement*. East Lansing, MI: The Institute for Research in Teaching (IRT), Michigan State University.

CALIFORNIA, STATE OF (1977). *California School Effectiveness Study: The First Year 1974-75*. State Department of Education.

CLANCY, P.L. (1982). *19 Improving Schools and Why*. Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University

EDMONDS, R. and J. FREDERICKSON (1979). *Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children*. ED 170 936.

GILLUM, R.M. (1977). "The Effects of Parent Involvement on Student Achievement in Three Michigan Performance Contracting Programs." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, New York City, April. ED 144 077.

HENDERSON, A. (1981). *Parent Participation - Student Achievement: The Evidence Grows*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for

Citizens in Education.

KEESLING, J.W., et al. (1980). Parents and Federal Education Programs: The Study of Parent Involvement. Santa Monica, CA: The Systems Development Corp. HEW 300-78-0437.

WAGENAAR, T.C. (1977). "School Achievement Level Vis-a-vis Community Involvement and Support." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (September). ED 146 111.

PART A3: WHAT PRACTICES MAKE A DIFFERENCE

This section contains a series of fifteen "fact sheets" which provide a birds' eye view of the evidence on what makes a difference.

The topics covered are as follows:

Fact Sheet No.	Topic and Title	Subtopics
1.	School Climate*	
2.	Cooperative Learning	
3.	Direct Instruction	
4.	Expectations*	
5.	Grade Promotion and Retention	
6.	Grouping	Ability Grouping, Grade Grouping, Small vs. Whole Group Instruction
7.	Homework	
8.	Individualized Instruction	
9.	Institutional Focus*	Basic Skills
10.	Instructional Leadership*	
11.	Use of Lesson Plans and Behavioral Objectives	
12.	Monitoring Pupil Progress*	Testing
13.	Participation	Decisionmaking, Co-production, At-home and In-school tutoring, Volunteers
14.	Teacher Praise and Feedback	
15.	Time-on-task	

Topics denoted by an asterisk (*) contain a summary of the issues and evidence for the five major factors associated with effective schools.

The other topics all pertain to other "school effects," i.e., policies and classroom practices which can be changed and which do make a difference. They include matters which can be obviously legislated at the district level, e.g., No. 1: Policies on Grade Promotion and Retention, or No. 2, "Grouping" by ability or grade level.

Given the way that the school effectiveness movement has evolved the topics denoted by an asterisk refer to building level policies.

Still other topics point to the classroom level -- e.g., No.'s 2, 11, 14 and 15 -- and their fact sheets provide summaries of the major evidence on teacher effectiveness, which is less easily legislated bot no less significant.

Indeed, it is at the level of classroom practice that the research reveals some interesting counter-intuitive evidence, throwing doubt on what so-called common sense and folklore dictates should work. As will be seen below, there is no foolproof educational technology that works the same for all children. Pedagogic strategies which work for high ability students don't benefit slow learners. If one tries to apply strategies that work for initially low achievers to the class in general, one risks boring and alienating high ability students. Also, different age-level groups and pupils from different socio-economic backgrounds respond differently to given models of teaching.

The "fact sheets" we offer range in length from one page charts or prose summaries to two to three page handouts with part in prose and part in chart form, inventorying the major findings and conclusions of the research evidence.

Please note, however, we offer summaries, not definitive syntheses or conclusions. On some topics the evidence is inconclusive and even inconsistent. Hence, these "fact sheets" will not settle all arguments about "what works."

A3: EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE **FACT SHEET NO. 1**
CLIMATE

SCHOOL CLIMATE

"Climate" is one of the now famous correlates of effectives schools. For a school, a good climate means having a safe, orderly and pleasant environment. In the effective schools research model, however, climate means more than the physical environment.

In fact, the physical environment (care and upkeep of the building) is just a manifestation of a deeper and more important attitude that permeates an effective school. In a recent essay, Larry Lezotte, a pioneer in the effective schools research, defined a school's "learning climate...as the norms, beliefs, and attitudes reflected in the instructional patterns and behavioral practices that enhance or impede student achievement."* Lezotte then goes on to say that "examining learning climate in effective schools research methodology relies heavily on moving from student outcomes, through observable patterns and practices, to the norms, beliefs, and attitudes that ground the pattern and practices."

Lezotte then indentifies six dimensions to a school's learning climate:

(1) Beliefs about the learning potential of students: "staff in an effective school believe that all children can learn what is expected of them."

(2) Beliefs about a teacher's ability to teach students the intended essential skills: "not only do teachers believe that students can learn but they also believe that they (the teachers) can teach them."

(3) Beliefs about the role of the school in society: "school exists primarily to insure that students master basic cognitive skills" and effective schools and teachers "allocate time and resources in accordance with these publicly recognized priorities."

---

* Lawrence W. Lezotte, "Climate Characteristics in Instructionally Effective Schools," n.d., unpublished paper, 10 pages. Available at cost of reproduction (10 cents per page) from the IRE Clearinghouse.

(4) Teamwork: effective schools' staff are "willing to forego some degree of autonomy to insure that their individual efforts fit into and serve long-term, overall goals of the school..." They concern themselves with the progressive [i.e cumulative] nature of the curriculum and are more willing to look to their professional colleagues for advice, support, and guidance.

(5) Leadership: "teachers recognize the need for coordination and support. They look to and expect their principals to be instructional leaders."

(6) Beliefs about appropriate environments: staff "promote a very 'business-like atmosphere'...they convey a sense of importance about the teaching and learning of essential skills."

Thus defined, the concept of climate encompasses many of the other factors that make a difference.

While four of the 36 studies briefed in Part A4 below focus explicitly on climate (Research Briefs No. 9, 18, 34, and 41), readers should check into Fact Sheets No. 4 and 9, on "Expectations" and "Institutional Focus", respectively.

FACT SHEET NO. 2: COOPERATIVE LEARNING: DOES IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS		REFERENCE	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Cooperative Learning and Student Self-Concept	Cooperative learning helps to enhance student self-concept. Team learning helps some children to have "success experiences."	Beane, et al (1980) Silvernail (1979)	4 35
Cooperative Learning and Academic Achievement	While team learning does help student self-esteem, it does not increase student motivation for academic achievement. Research on motivation for achievement favors the use of individual rather than group competition and reward.	Silvernail (1979)	35
Cooperative Learning and Student Grouping: What Works?	Students with high self-concepts are more likely to compete, while low-concept students are likely to cooperate. Two high self-concept students in the same group will compete with one another rather than cooperate with the group. Grouping strategies should try to isolate high self-concept students (one to a group) so that their competition does not turn a learning team into a competition situation.	Devoe (1977)	15

From: A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS, by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

DIRECT INSTRUCTION

"Direct" instruction is a term used to describe what to many laypeople will sound like an old-fashioned approach to teaching.

As summarized by Rosenshine (1976*) it describes a teacher as a dominant leader, who chooses the activities that take place and functions in a direct business-like manner with instruction organized around questions posed by the teacher and not the pupil. In direct instruction, more of the class time is spent on the teacher talking directly to pupils either through a lecture presentation or through group drill and recitation. There is more highly structured seatwork, immediate corrective feedback, and little independent study.

Three of the studies briefed in Part A4 below contain findings and summaries of the state-of-the-knowledge on whether direct instruction makes a positive difference, for what outcomes, and under what circumstances. These are: Kash and Bouch (1982), Brief No. 26; Rich and Bush (1978), Brief No. 33; and Silvernail (1979), Brief No. 35. The evidence is that:

(1) Direct instruction is more effective with younger, more immature, shy and lower ability students.

(2) It works for teaching the most basic of basic skills at the lower grades for pupils of all socio-economic backgrounds.

(3) When accompanied by a slower pacing of learning objectives and a mastery learning approach, it is more effective for low SES pupils of all ages.

---

* Rosenshine, B. "Recent Research in Teacher Behaviors and Student Achievement," in Journal of Teacher Education, 1976.

A3: EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE? **FACT SHEET NO. 4**
EXPECTATIONS

EXPECTATIONS THAT ALL STUDENTS CAN MASTER THE MINIMUM SKILLS

The effective schools research has found that, in part, what made effective schools different was that school staff refused to accept an early 1970's bit of conventional wisdom which said: some children are so handicapped by cultural and economic deprivation that they will never catch up and there is a limit to what schools can do.

"Expectations" then acts as a self-fulfilling prophecy, not unlike the famous Pygmalian effect. Nine of the 36 research studies briefed in Part A4 had evidence on the factor of expectations. These include Brief Nos. 2, 6, 9, 10, 16, 20, 30, 35, and 36. Some of the more interesting findings are as follows.

Findings and Conclusions	Reference	Brief No.
Teachers in declining schools spent less time on reading instruction because they had lower expectations of students.	Brookover and Lezotte (1979)	6 - 8
The more information teachers had about students, the higher their expectations and the more instruction was given to students.	Carrahan, R. (1980)	11
Teachers in effective schools held the belief that there should be common standards of achievement for all students.	Edmonds and Frederickson (1979)	18
There is a high correlation between students' perceptions of parent and teacher expectations and student aspiration, and actual student achievement.	Gigliotti and Brookover (1975)	22

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

FACT SHEET NO. 5: GRADE PROMOTION AND RETENTION

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS		REFERENCES	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Academic Achievement	Students do not necessarily learn more by repeating a grade.	ERIC/CEM (1980)	19
	Retained and promoted students have similar achievement records in the early years of schooling, but there is a substantial decrease in retained students' achievement in the later grades.	Thompson, S. (1980)	38
	Threats of non-promotion do not motivate students to better performance.	ERIC/CEM (1980)	19
Bias in Retention Practices	Retention practices tend to mirror social inequalities: studies identifying patterns on who gets retained reveal that among samples of students with equally low achievement levels, the best predictor is pupil SES: the lower the status, the greater the likelihood of retention.	ERIC/CEM (1980)	19
Pupil Self-Concept	Retention does not adversely affect pupil self-concept in the early years. Borderline promoted pupils suffered lower self-concept than retained pupils.	Finlayson (1977)	21
When Does Retention Work?	When it is done early, when retention is for social (i.e., immaturity) rather than academic reasons, and when the decision has positive parent support.	ERIC/CEM (1980)	19

From: A CITIZEN'S NOTBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS, by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, MI.

A3: EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE?

FACT SHEET NO. 6
HOW STUDENTS ARE GROUPED

Ability Grouping, Grade Grouping, Small vs. Whole Group Instruction

---

DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE HOW STUDENTS ARE GROUPED?

Long before the advent of the school effectiveness research, there existed much public and professional discussion about the efficacy of different ways of grouping students. Advocates of self-paced learning and of individualized instruction see intra-classroom ability grouping as a real-world and beneficial compromise between the ideal of totally individualized instruction and the realities of classroom management, in rooms with 20 or more pupils.

Critics see ability grouping as a species of intra-classroom tracking, dampening the expectations and self-esteem of students initially assigned to the "lower" ability groups. On the other hand, others see the creation of "pull-out", "gifted" and "enrichment programs" as examples of de facto "tracking," which siphons off the "best-and-the-brightest" from classroom instruction. Complicating the issue is some ambiguous evidence about the efficacy of small group vs. whole group instruction in achieving particular outcomes, on particular objectives, for different categories of students.

The debate, at the level of rhetoric, about grouping goes on and on. Here we offer a summary of the research evidence on the effects of different ways of grouping -- ABILITY GROUPING, GRADE GROUPING, and SMALL VS. WHOLE GROUP INSTRUCTION -- on valued student outcomes. The evidence is arranged in chart form, on the page immediately following.

FACT SHEET NO. 6: DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE HOW STUDENTS ARE GROUPED?

TYPE OF GROUPING PRACTICE	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	REFERENCES	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Ability Grouping	Achievement: Ability grouping tented to benefit superior pupils while random grouping helped slower pupils	Borg (1981)	5
	Achievement: More effective schools did not separate students into too many ability groups	Edmonds and Frederickson (1979)	18
	Achievement: Heterogeneous grouping is more effective than homogeneous grouping -- two ability groups per room seemed to have the best results	Azumi and Madhere (1982) (1982)	2
	Achievement: Ability grouping helped math achievement among superior pupils and science achievement among average pupils	Borg (1981)	5
	Pupil Self-Concept: Average and slow pupils have a better chance of gaining social recognition -- of being a "star" in ability grouped classrooms. But for all ability levels, pupils in random grouped classrooms had more favorable self-concepts.	Borg (1981)	5
	Improving schools had flexible grouping in which pupils moved in and out of different ability groups on different subjects.	California (1977)	16
Grade Grouping	Heterogeneous grouping can be beneficial. Cognitively it makes little difference -- there are no differences in pupil achievement between regular and multi-graded situations but children get social and "maturational" benefits from heterogeneous arrangements.	Lincoln (1982) Martin and Pavan (1976)	28 29

FACT SHEET NO. 6: DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE HOW STUDENTS ARE GROUPED? (continued)

TYPE OF GROUPING PRACTICE	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	REFERENCES	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Small vs. Whole Group Instruction	Junior High School students who were taught in small groups scored better on achievement and self-concept tests.	Davries (1980)	16
	Successful schools in teaching reading in the early grades used a combination of whole group instruction as introduction, followed by small group instruction while the rest of the class was engaged in silent reading.	Philadelphia (1979)	32
	Small group instruction is better for basic skills in the first and second grades.	Kash and Bouch (1982) (1982)	26
	Whole class instruction works better for math and reading in the upper grades.	Kash and Bouch (1982)	26
	Pupil peer tutoring and unsupervised individual and/or small group work are negatively correlated with pupil achievement at the early grades.	Kash and Bouth (1982)	29
	Whole group instruction lessens a teacher's ability to give individual feedback, and promotes the use of gross rather than fine measures of individual pupil progress.	Bossert (1978)	6
	Whole group instruction promotes comparative judgements of pupil work and progress. It can depress teacher expectations for low ability pupils.	Bossert (1978)	6

A3: EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE? **FACT SHEET NO. 7**
HOMEWORK

HOMEWORK: DOES IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

In popular discussions, the school effectiveness movement, although its origins are somewhat different, has become part of what is now a decade-old effort to increase "productivity" in schooling. Many communities have debated whether "homework" as previous generations of school children have experienced it, should be re-instituted, increased, or initiated in lower grades.

The research evidence on this topic -- is homework associated with schools' effectiveness in teaching the basic skills to all children? -- is quite thin. This is due mostly to the fact that homowork is not used much in the lower grades.

Only two out of the 36 studies "briefed" in Part 4A below, have any findings with respect to homework; Azumi and Madhere (1982), Research Brief No. 2; and Rutter, et al. (1979), Research Brief No. 34. The former dealt with the 6th grade level, the latter with schooling for a sample of 11 to 13 year olds.

Both show that homework is important. Azumi and Madhere found that teachers who gave more homework had classes with higher achievement scores. Since this was a correlation it is not clear whether the homework caused the higher achievement, or whether teachers who had "brighter" students were more apt to give homework.

Rutter, et al., found that the regular assignment of homework was an indicator of the academic emphasis which differentiated effective from less effective schools. But this only made a difference when homework was regularly checked and students were given extensive feedback on their completed assignments.

FACT SHEET NO. 8: INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

RESEARCH BRIEF #

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	REFERENCES	
Large group instruction is as effective as individualized instruction teaching reading in the early elementary grades.	Philadelphia (1979)	32
Individualized instruction helps teachers to more closely monitor individual pupil progress. Pacing learning to a whole group also tends to minimize teacher expectations for pupils at either end of the ability spectrum.	Bossert (1978)	6
The effective schools in poor urban settings tended to use more individualized instruction than the other schools.	Armor, et al. (1977)	1
	Clark, et al. (1980)	13
	Huit and Segars (1980)	25
	Weber (1971)	36
Individualization makes the most positive difference with students at the extremes -- with either gifted or very low ability students.	ERIC/CEM (1980)	19
Factors which promote success in individualized instruction are: principal leadership, staff commitment and upper level administrative support.	ERIC/CEM (1980)	19
Factors which inhibit success are: lack of teacher preparation and lack of community acceptance due to the back to basics mood of public opinion.	ERIC/CEM (1980)	19

From: A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS, by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, MI.

A3: EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE? **FACT SHEET NO. 9**
INSTITUTIONAL FOCUS

INSTITUTIONAL FOCUS

"Focus" is best defined by describing and documenting that all parties to the learning proces--pupils, teachers, and parents --give the same answer to the question: what is the purpose of this school? When the common answer is "to teach the basic skills" the school community allocates (and re-allocates) resources towards that end.

Thirty-one plus of the 36 major studies briefed in Part A4 below paid special attention to the evidence of institutional focus. Their major findings and conclusions are as follows:

Findings	References	Brief No.
Effective schools had a set of integrated curriculum goals which incorporated mastery of basic skills for all students.	Clark, et al (1980)	13
	Edmonds and Frederickson (1979)	18
	Gigliotti and Brookover (1975)	22
Improving schools were more specific in their goals and objectives for basic skills.	Brookover and Lazotte (1979)	8
The more clearly that school goals were defined, the higher the expectations on the part of teachers that all children can learn.	Azumi and Madhere (1982)	2

A3: EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE?

FACT SHEET NO. 10
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: WHAT CAN PRINCIPALS DO?

The school effectiveness research compared the efficacy of different schools, often within the same school district. What made one school different from another? This question led naturally to a consideration of what it is that principals did that made effective schools different. This brings us to the concept of "instructional leadership."

That concept is in danger of becoming a cliche. But behind the concept, is a body of research evidence defining what *actions* define instructional leadership, what *conditions* facilitate its exercise, and what *backgrounds* and *skills* are most likely associated with the role of an instructional leader. That evidence is summarized in chart form on the next page.

The evidence suggests, first, that instructional leadership is not a trait but a set of behaviors and previously acquired skills. There is noting especially charismatic about instructional leadership.

Second, there is nothing especially dictatorial about leadership of this sort. It is earned -- i.e., created by followership and not imposed.

Third, and this is a corrollary of the second point, it cannot be directly legislated. Leadership is inherent in what a person does, and not in his/her formal position: leadership can (and has often been) exercised by leaders other than principals.

There are however some policies relevant to the kind of issues and influence that citizens can raise and bring to bear on school operations.

One, you are more likely to get an instructional leader if you hire principals with a prior background as curriculum or reading specialists.

Two, something has to give. If principals are to be more active as instructional *leaders*, they may need to have relief from some of their duties as *building managers*.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

FACT SHEET NO. 10: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: WHAT CAN PRINCIPALS AND OTHER ADMINISTRATORS DO?

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS		REFERENCES	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Actions: Instructional Leadership is Exercised By:	Developing school-community links and communication	Armor, et al. (1977)	1
	More communication between staff and principals and a greater frequency of principal evaluation and observation of teachers	Azumi and Madhere (1982) Brookover and Lezotte (1979) Gigliotti and Brookover (1975) Philadelphia (1979)	2 8 22 32
	Assuming more responsibility	Brookover and Lezotte (1976)	8
	Being more active in developing curricula, standards and materials	California (1977) Clancy (1982	10 12
Conditions Associated With Greater Exercise of Instructional Leadership	More influence and authority in hiring staff	California (1977)	10
Background:	Instructional leadership in effective schools was most often exercised by principals and assistant principals with prior experience as reading specialists	Clancy (1982); Clark (1980) New York (1974) Philadelphia Weber (1971)	12, 13 31 32 41

FACT SHEET NO. 11: USE OF LESSON PLANS AND BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES

STRATEGY	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	REFERENCES	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Use of Behavioral Objectives	Can make a positive difference when and if: students are aware of the objectives, and understand them and their importance; and when the objectives are presented to students during or following, but not before the presentation of the material.	Melton (1978)	30
Lesson Plans	In classrooms, where teachers do more planning, students spend more time-on-task.	Carnahan (1980)	11
	The more information that teachers have about their pupils, and the more the plans are disaggregated to take into account the ability levels and learning styles of different pupils in a classroom, the more impact lesson plans have on achievement.	Carhahan (1980) Huit and Segars (1980)	11 25
	Lesson plans based on diagnostic testing data are more effective.	Clancy (1982)	12
	Very elaborate and creative lesson plans appear to benefit high rather than low ability students. "Creative" challenging activities benefit high achievers and harm low achievers.	Talmage and Rasher (1979)	37

From: A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS, by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, MI.

A3: THE EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE?

FACT SHEET NO. 12
MONITORING PUPIL PROGRESS

MONITORING PUPIL PROGRESS

With this as with most of the correlates of effective schools, there is a deceptive sense of the obvious: it is important to monitor progress. The key, however, is to monitor progress not just aggregate levels of achievement. Effective schools, say Ron Edmonds and Larry Lezotte, have a data base -- record of pupil progress -- which tells them what is working, and what isn't. Seven out of the 36 research studies have found evidence that monitoring is one factor that makes a difference. Some of the more specific and interesting findings are as follows.

Findings and Conclusions	References	Brief No.
Monitoring means individual charts of pupil progress, not just more and more testing.	Kash and Bouch (1982) Weber (1971)	23 36
Effective schools made more use of standardized tests rather than teacher-made tests for placement and evaluation purposes.	California (1977)	8
Effective schools used more diagnostic testing upon which performance objectives and progress measures were based.	Clancy (1982)	10

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

DOES CITIZEN AND PARENT PARTICIPATION MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

THE ISSUE

Our focus is on whether citizen and parent participation makes a difference for a school's ability to effectively instruct all children under its care. That is, we are looking for evidence which says: The more participation in a given school, the more instructionally effective is that school.

Our focus is not on evidence which shows that participation makes a differrence for the academic achievement of children of the participants. That is, we did not look for, nor are we presenting, evidence of what individual parents can do that makes a difference for their own children's academic achievement.

OUR FOCUS

Given this perspective, we approach the research literature for clues which can answer the two questions:

(1) What kinds of things should citizens do in order to help make their schools more effective for all children?

(2) What kinds of school initiated practices promote that kind of citizen and parent involvement which leads to improved academic achievement?

Both questions assume that the primary responsibility for achieving learning outcomes rests with the school, and not with the family. Although they come at the issue from different ends, they are not unrelated.

Clues which provide answers to the second question provide an agenda for citizen participation. If it is the case that certain school practices create the kind of parent and citizen involvement that make a difference, and if those practices can be "legislated" at the local level, then citizen activists have something to lobby for at the level of policy: namely, those school practices which promote and make possible parent and citizen action which increases school effectiveness.

SOURCES

Eleven out of the 41 studies briefed in Part A4, below, pro-vide such clues. They are: Armcr, et al, 1976 (Brief No. 1), Barth, 1979 (Brief No. 3), Beane, et al. 1980 (Brief No. 4), Brookover and Lezotte, 1979 (Brief No. 8), California, 1977 (Brief No. 10), Clancy, 1982 (Brief No. 12), Edmonds and Frederickson, 1979 (Brief No. 18), Gillum, 1977 (Brief No. 23), Keesling, et al., 1980 (Brief No. 27), and Wagenaar, 1977 (Brief No. 40).

Some of the above studies explicitly set out to investigate the efficacy of school-initiated parent participation activities (e.g., Barth, Boulder Valley, Gillum, and Keesling). Others (e.g., Armor, et al., Beane, et al., California, Clancy, and Wagenaar) set out to identify what role parent participation played, in conjunction with other factors, in more effective schools. Still other studies (Brookover and Lezotte, Edmonds and Frederickson) made more inductive discoveries about participation; that is, they did not look for it but it cropped up in their findings.

A FRAMEWORK FOR ORGANIZING THE "FACTS"

The eleven studies are even more heterogeneous in their operational definitions and measures of participation. We summarize their findings -- the "facts" -- in terms of a framework which is based on everyday differences in the way which citizens and parents interact with schools.

Citizens and parents interact with schools in one of three ways: as advocates; as decisionmaking partners; and as co-production partners.

"Advocacy refers to citizen action that is explicitly political. That is, it refers to activities designed to influence policies -- directives for schools to do something different -- and to make sure that those directives are implemented through watchdogging kinds of activities.

"Decisionmaking" refers to those kinds of activities -- such as serving on policy boards, task forces, and advisory councils and committees of various kinds -- in which citizens help make decisions about the implementation of policy directives and the allocation of resources devoted to school improvement.

"Co-production" refers to those activities, individual or collective, in-school or at home, which contribute to school efforts to insruct pupils and raise pupil achievement. Such activities include: school-home coordinated at-home tutoring programs; more home-school communication and parent-education designed to make parents more knowledgeable about what schools are trying to teach and how their children are progressing; volunteering activities such as in-school tutoring in basic skills and the provision of enrichment programs.

In summary, the distinction among the three types of participation is as follows: "advocacy" seeks to influence or change and/or support decisions about how a school system's emphases and resources are re-allocated; "decisionmaking" seeks to influence the implementation of those resource re-allocation decisions; while "co-production" adds resources to the school system's capaity to improve achievement for all students.

WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE?

The findings and conclusions from the eleven aforementioned studies are presented on the chart which follows this discussion. The left-hand column categorizes the findings in terms of the kinds of citizen/parent participation envisioned by the three-part formula of participation as advocacy, decisionmaking, and co-production.

FACT SHEET NO. 13: DOES CITIZEN AND PARENT PARTICIPATION MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

TYPE AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	RESEARCH CLUES: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND INFERENCES	REFERENCE	BRIEF #
General: Does the overall level of citizen/parent participation affect achievement?	It is not the overall amount but the type of participation which effects student achievement.	Wagenaar (1977)	41
	One kind of participation begets another: Where there are higher levels of participation in decisionmaking there are also higher levels of participation in co-production type of activities.	Keesling, et al., (1980)	27
	In high-achievement schools, with pupils of low socio-economic status, principals reported the community as being more supportive than in low achieving schools.	California (1977)	10
	On the whole, there was less parent involvement in "improving" (i.e., more effective schools) but...	Brookover and Lezotte, (1979)	8
	Involvement in the improving schools tended to be more parent initiated, than school initiated.	(ibid)	
Advocacy: Lobbying and Watchdogging	We found no evidence in the school effectiveness research suggesting that citizens' lobbying and watchdogging activities are associated with increased school effectiveness.		
	One reason for the above is that citizen/parent participation of all kinds exhibits a class bias: For all kinds of participation, the higher the community SES, the higher the overall levels of participation, of all kinds; and for any individual school the higher the pupil SES, the higher the levels of advocacy, and other kinds of citizen/parent participation, and the higher the levels of pupil achievement.		
	But, of the schools and school districts surveyed for this Notebook, responded. Of these, identified citizen lobbying activity as instrumental in initiating efforts to improve local school effectiveness.	See "Part B", below	

FACT SHEET NO. 13 (continued):

TYPE AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	RESEARCH CLUES: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND INFERENCES	REFERENCE	BRIEF #
Decisionmaking	Of all kinds of participation, "decisionmaking" was least correlated with school's effectiveness.	Wagenaar (1977)	41
Co-Production: What kinds of school initiated parent involvement activities make a difference	More regular contact between school and home -- meetings and written communications makes a difference.	Barth (1979)	3
		Boulder Valley (1975)	7
		Clancy (1982)	12
		Wagenaar (1977)	41
	Parent education, especially on a peer basis, with parent trainers, makes a difference.	Gillum (1977)	23
	Inservice training for teachers and administrators on home-school contacts also makes a difference.	Gillum (1977)	23
	School designed at-home reinforcement activities make a difference.	Barth (1979)	3
		Boulder Valley (1975)	1
		Gillum (1977)	23
	Volunteering and in-school tutoring: elderly volunteers in the classroom enhance pupil self-concept and thereby contribute to pupil achievement.	Beane, et al. (1980)	5
	Parent volunteers and in-school tutors are more likely to reinforce their children's learning at home.	Keesling, et al. (1980)	27

FACT SHEET NO. 14: TEACHER PRAISE AND FEEDBACK

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	REFERENCE	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Consistent positive praise is more effective than random compliments.	Beane, et al (1980)	4
Praise of a student is often intended to motivate other students (to imitate the praised behavior) rather than to reinforce the student being praised...	Brophy (1981)	9
...but praise based on comparisons to other students has no positive effects.	Bossert (1978) Rutter, et al. (1979)	6 34
Praise directly related to specific pupil performances and products is positively related to achievement gains for both high and low ability students.	Kash and Bouch (1982)	26
Praise has a positive impact on low SES pupils, but little impact on high SES pupils.	Kash and Bouch (1982)	26
Young children are more apt to respond to praise, other pupils are more apt to respond to grades as a motivation.	Silvernail (1979)	35

From: A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS, by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, MI.

A3: EVIDENCE: WHAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE? **FACT SHEET NO. 15**
TIME-ON-TASK

TIME-ON-TASK

Like instructional leadership, "time-on-task" has become a buzzword. It stems from the notion that one way to measure a school's "institutional focus and commitment to the teaching of basic skills" is to see how much teaching time is devoted to those skills. Underlying this is the common sense notion that "more equals more": more input (instruction), means more output (student achievement).

Lately, studies and writings on this topic of time-on-task have become a growth industry. In this fact sheet, we provide an introduction to the evidence on this topic (see chart on the next page) which suggests interesting wrinkles that challenge the assumption that more "input" necessarily means more "output."

Specifically, the key issues are: There is a difference between "allocated time" (time teachers set aside for direct instruction) and "engaged time" (the time students actually spent attending to learning tasks). More time per se is not important; what counts is quality of that time. And, finally, time-on-task is more important for younger and lower ability students.

FACT SHEET NO. 15: TIME-ON-TASK

FINDING AND CONCLUSIONS	REFERENCES	RESEARCH BRIEF #
Time spent on teaching reading was more important (in raising achievement) than type of method or materials.	Azumi and Madhere (1979)	2
The more student and teacher absenteeism the lower the achievement. Also, the more time a classroom teacher spent away from direct interaction with pupils -- through absence, inservice during class hours, or even by using reading aides -- the less pupils learned.	Azumi and Madhere (1979 Philadelphia (1979)	2 32
Longer school days or years per se will have no effect on pupil achievement unless the extra time engages students in learning. But for low SES students, attendance at summer school was positively associated with increased achievement.	Kash and Bouch (1982)	26
Students spend more time on task when their teachers had more organized and well planned lessons.	Carrahan (1980)	11
Time-on-task recipes need to recognize that some students require more time than others to master a given subject matter.	Huit and Segars (1980)	25
When teachers' styles were congruent with the developmental level of pupils -- i.e., indirect instruction for mature and high ability students and direct instruction for low ability students -- pupils spent more time on task.	Rich and Bush (1978)	33
High ability, high achievement students were less positively affected by increased time-on-task. In fact, at the margin, more time led to decreased achievement.	Talmadge and Rasher (1979)	37

PART A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE

This section is a layperson's digest of 41 research studies that have made a difference in terms of current understanding of what works to produce learning outcomes. Our focus is on research evidence that is accessible and that deals with "public" issues.

By "public," we mean two things. First, we limit our attention to studies or parts of studies which identify factors which can be influenced by public discussion and/or consciously changed by policy decisions at the local school district level. If some factor, such as pupil socio-economic status, is not easily changed at the level of policy, it is not included in this inventory of research.

Second, by "public," we mean those studies which are most often cited, as "expert witnesses," in discussions about how to make schools better -- more effective for all children.

This section provides readers with an introduction to these "expert witnesses." The introductions consist of Briefs, which are digests of major studies. These Briefs are presented alphabetically by author, and, for ease of cross-reference, are numbered consecutively. (Please note: This is the same format and procedure we adopt in subsequent sections where we present one-page Briefs of local school improvement projects -- in Part B -- and of resource organizations and people -- in Parts C3 and C4, respectively.

Each Brief is designed to stand alone as a separate handout. Each gives a more detailed summary of a study and its evidence, as cited in the summary Fact Sheets in Part A3. Our intent is that readers will use and recombine the component parts of this Notebook so that on any given issue, they themselves can create their own resource guide.

There are a number of different kinds of "expert witnesses" introduced in the pages which follow. These include:

(1) The nine classic primary studies which have defined the school effectiveness movement (see Brief No.'s 2, 8, 10, 12, 18, 31, 32, 34 and 41).

(2) Eleven studies which investigate the connection between citizen and parent participation and schools' ability to improve instruction (see Brief No.'s 7, 8, 10, 12, 18, 22, 31, 32, 34 and 41).

(3) A number of other studies which investigate classroom management and teacher effectiveness (see Brief No.'s 4-5, 6, 9, 11, 15-16, 19, 24-26, 30, 35-37, and 39).

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 1

Climate, instructional leadership, participation

ARMOR, D., et al; (1976). *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Prepared for the Los Angeles Unified School District. R-2007-LAUSD.

This report is about a study of the "School Preferred Reading Program" in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Under this program, elementary schools in the district identified students who were scoring at the 25th percentile or lower on standardized reading tests. Each school then targeted specific objectives for reading gains at the 3rd and 6th grade levels, and developed programs to achieve those ends. Researchers set out to determine which aspects of the many different school reading programs led to substantial and consistent gains in reading scores among minority students, based on a sample of 20 elementary schools. It found that:

(1) Flexibility in use of materials is important, but which specific materials are used is not.

(2) Active participation of teachers in implementing and maintaining a program is important; informal consultation, in which teachers use each other as resources, is particularly useful.

(3) For black students, gains correlate with a high degree of parent/community involvement in schools. No such correlation is found with Mexican-American students.

(4) Principals are a key to developing strong school-community relationships.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 2

Attendance, ability grouping, expectations, homework, institutional focus, instructional leadership, time-on-task

AZUMI, J. and S. MADHERE (1982). "Characteristics of High Achieving Elementary Schools in Newark." Newark School District Research Report, Office of Research, Evaluation and Testing. ED 217 099.

Fifty-two Newark, New Jersey public elementary school were studied to identify organizational factors which determine student achievement. Data was gathered from questionnaires (given to principals, teachers and students), school records, and student math and reading achievement scores.

The following variables were found to have a direct effect on student achievement:

(1) Expectation and Institutional Focus: The higher the teachers' expectations were and the more clearly teachers felt that school goals were defined, the higher achievement scores were.

(2) Time-on-task and Attendance: The more time-on-task the more achievement will result. Also, achievement was negatively correlated with student and teacher absenteeism.

(3) Homework: At the sixth grade level, teachers who gave more homework had students with higher achievement scores.

(4) Grouping: An average of two ability groups in a class-room was associated with higher achievement scores than classrooms with three or more ability groups. This indicates heterogeneous ability grouping is more effective than homogeneous ability grouping.

(5) Instructional Leadership: Schools with higher achievement were characterized by more communication between staff and principals and greater frequency of principal observation and evaluation.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 3

Co-production, tutoring: at-home

BARTH, R. (1979). "Home-based Reinforcement of School Behavior: A Review and Analysis." Review of Educational Research 49, No. 3, (Summer).

What parents can do at home and, more importantly, what schools can do to promote and facilitate home learning does make a difference is the conclusion of this review of 24 studies on parental reinforcement of in-school learning activities.

Reinforcement consisted of at-home rewards and support for in-school activities an objectives. This did make a difference for student academic achievement. At-home reinforcement was initiated by school contacts ranging from daily or weekly notes to more elaborate plans and recipes.

Barth's review found, however, that almost any kind of systematic regular contact made a difference, and that there was no need for elaborate parent education programs.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 4**

Ability grouping, cooperative learning, co-production, teacher praise, tutoring: in-school, volunteers

---

BEANE, J.A., R.P. LIPKA, and J.W. LUDEWIG, (1980). "A Synthesis of Research on Self-Concept." Educational Leadership (October).

It is the pupil who is the ultimate producer of achievement outcomes. High expectations "work" becuase they send a message to each pupil -- a message that success is possible. The present state-of-the-research summary looked at the correlates of student self-concept, and uncovered the following implications for school practices.

Ability Grouping: Use a variety of grouping patterns rather than always grouping students by ability.

Teacher Praise and Feedback: Consistent positive feedback is more effective than a few random compliments.

Cooperative Learning: Minimize failure and create more success experiences through such practices as team learning.

Participation: Provide for interaction with older people via cross-age tutoring and involving elderly people in school activities. Assist parents to enhance their children's self- perceptions by conducting parent education workshops.

Ability grouping

BORG, W.R. (1981). "Ability Grouping," in REFLECTIONS ON RESEARCH. Available from the Institute on Research in Teaching (IRT), at Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.

This study examined the effects of two different grouping strategies -- one employing random grouping with enrichment, the other employing ability grouping with acceleration, in two adjacent and closely comparable Utah school districts. Data were collected over a four year period. Key findings relevant to the topics of interest in this note-book are:

Achievement: There was little overall difference although ability grouping favored superior pupils, while random grouping helped slow pupils. For average pupils, there was no difference.

Achievement by subject matter: Ability grouping helped math achievement among superior pupils, and science achievement among average pupils.

Pupil self-concept: Evidence is ambivalent. Average and slow pupils have a better chance of gaining social recognition -- of being a "star" in ability grouped classrooms. But for all ability levels, pupils in random grouped classrooms had more favorable self-concepts.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 6**

Individualized instruction, small vs. whole group instruction, teacher praise, tracking

BOSSERT, S. T. (1978) Activity Structures and Student Outcomes. Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education's Conference on School Organization and Effects, San Diego, CA (January) 1978. ED 201 695.

Based on a review of the research on the effective classroom, Bossert stresses attention on the following "activity structures" which maximize student achievement:

(1) Individualization: Bossert makes note of evidence about the pacing and sequencing of learning tasks. Teachers tend to pace lessons according to the reactions of a "steering group" of students; those who are faster or slower get less responsive attention.

(2) Small vs. Whole Group Instruction and Teacher Praise and Feedback: The structure of activities in a classroom determines the teacher's ability to give appropriate feedback. In whole class work, teachers tend to assess student performance by using comparisons to other students rather than gauging individual progress.

(3) Tracking and Student Self-Concept: Tracking in schools leads to a sense of group membership among students that may or may not be beneficial. Bossert describes how friendship cliques within classrooms that do activities collectively are almost always composed of students that are achieving at the same level. These cliques are high in intragroup solidarity, but they also generate high intergroup competition.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 7**

Co-production, home-school communication, parent education

BOULDER VALLEY (L975). "Personalized Kindergarten Program with Supplementary Parent Involvement: A Final Report." Boulder Valley Colorado School District. ED 116 791.

This is a local evaluation study of a project which identified "high need" kindergarten children, those who were identified as "less ready" for school. Part of this group was randomly assigned to a program designed to stimulate parental involvement. This was the "experimental group." The families of the other, "control group," received no special attention.

Both groups are tested at the beginning of kindergarten, at the end of kindergarten, and at the beginning of the first grade. There was no difference in the kinderarten -- at the end both groups scored equally. But at the beginning of the first grade, the experimental group showed a higher level of maintaining achievement and readiness gains than did the control group.

What the school did to stimulate parent involvement was the following: (a) biweekly meetings between parent and teacher (b) parent education workshops; and (c) each participating family agreed to spend ten minutes a day with their children on specific educational activities.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 8

Expectations, institutional focus, instructional leadership, participation

---

BROOKOVER, W., and L. LEZOTTE (1979). School Characteristics Associated with Changes in Student Achievement. The Institute for Research in Teaching (IRT), Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.*

This is a classic, albeit hard to get, school effectiveness study. It follows the classic school effects research model, albeit with a comparative twist: Identify successful schools and then see what makes them similar, and different, from unsuccessful schools serving similar pupil populations.

Since Michigan give a criterion referenced test to all fourth and seventh graders, the researchers in this study were able to identify six schools which were clearly improving over the previous three years, and two schools which were declining. Only schools which had not experienced a major change in student composition were studied, so the expectation was that some kind of organizational or instructional change(s) took place to cause the improvement or decline. Using questionnaires and interviews, the researchers attempted to identify how the improving schools differed from the declining schools. Information was collected on student and community characteristics, instructional goals and objectives, teachers' expectations, organizational patterns, teaching materials and methods, district and state policies, and interpersonal relationships and morale.

The researchers found clear differences between the improving and declining schools:

(1) Institutional Focus: The improving schools placed significantly more emphasis on accomplishing basic reading and math goals and were more specific in their goals and objectives than the declining schools.

---

* A discussion of this study's findings and its implication in the context of other evidence can be found in: Brookover, R.W., et al., (1979), School Social Systems and Student Achievement (NY: Praeger).

(2) Expectations: The staff at the improving schools believed that their students could attain these basic skills objectives, whereas the teachers and principals in the declining schools thought that their students had low ability levels and could not master basic skills. Accountability for teaching basic skills was directly assumed by teachers in improving schools, whereas teachers in declining schools spent less time on reading instruction because they had lower expectations of the students.

(3) Instructional Leadership: Principals in improving schools were less chummy with their staff than in declining schools, but were more active in instructional leadership and discipline. Interestingly, the declining schools had overall higher morale and staff satisfaction than improving schools; the authors attribute this to a sense of complacency on the part of the declining school staff members, and dissatisfaction with current achievement levels on the part of improving school staff members.

(4) Participation: Parent involvement was less on the whole in improving schools, but what involvement there was tended to be more parent-initiated than in declining schools.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 9

Teacher praise

BROPHY, J. (1981). "Teacher Praise: A Functional Analysis." Review of Educational Research (Spring).

A critical review of the research by a one-time advocate of and investigator of the achievement effects of teacher praise, concludes that "praise" does not really improve student performance. After re-examining the data, including his own, on what actually occurs in interactions between teachers and students, Brophy notes that:

(1) Much praise is not deliberate reinforcement but spontaneous reaction, elicited by quality of performance, or by students' bids for praise.

(2) Some praise is really conditioned behavior that students elicit and reinforce.

(3) Praise of a student is often intended to motivate other students (to imitate the praised behavior), not to reinforce the praised student.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 10

Ability grouping, direct instruction, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil achievement, time-on-task

---

CALIFORNIA, STATE OF (1977). California School Effectiveness Study: The First Year 1974-75. State Department of Education*

A preliminary report on a study funded by the California State Legislature, whose purpose was to identify school factors which are related to student achievement. Twenty-one pairs of schools were studied. The schools in each pair were matched in such a way that they were similar in all respects except that one of each pair was significantly higher achieving than the other. Interviews, questionnaires, observations, and fiscal data were used to gather information on three main categories: staff characteristics, student and staff contact, and organizational processes.

In terms of the factors which subsequent research on school effectiveness has identified as important, this study's findings are as follows:

(1) Principals as instructional leaders: Principals of higher achieving schools were more experienced, and were perceived by their teachers as being helpful and supportive, as well as having more influence in curriculum development and hiring of staff. Teachers in effective schools felt they had better working relationships with their principals. Principals gave more support to teachers in discipline situations.

(2) Direct instruction: There was no significant relationship between number of school counselors and achievement, but specialists in higher achieving schools did more direct instruction of students than in lower achieving schools.

(3) Time on task: There were no significant differences in the amount of time spent on various subject areas, except that in higher achieving schools there was more social studies and less math than in lower achieving schools. One interesting finding was that attendance in summer school was significantly associated with increased achievement, particularly for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.

---

* Copies available from the Institute for Responsive Education Clearinghouse at 10 cents per page copying, handling and mailing.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

(4) Monitoring pupil progress: Effective schools made more use of standardized tests rather than teacher-made tests for placement and evaluation purposes.

(5) Participation: Higher achieving schools in low socio-economic areas had more adult volunteers, although this relationship was not found in high socio-economic areas. Also, in higher achieving schools in low socio-economic areas, the community was viewed by principals as more "supportive" than in lower achieving schools.

(6) Ability grouping: Effective schools used different groups (within the classroom) working at different paces.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 11**

Expectations, lesson plans, time-on-task

CARNAHAN, R. (1980). Effects of Teacher Planning on Classroom Processes. Technical Report No. 541, Wisconsin R & D Center, Madison, Wisconsin.

A two week study of nine fifth grade math classes showed that students spent more "time-on-task" when their teachers had planned and organized their lessons well.

The study also investigated the effects of different levels of information about students on teacher behavior and on student performance. One group of teachers was given information about their students' math aptitudes and suggestions for ways to motivate the students. A second group was given aptitude information only, and a third group was given no information.

The amount of information had no effect on how much planning teachers did. But it was correlated with student achievement. Students of teachers who had aptitude information scored higher than those of teachers who had no information. And students whose teachers had both kinds of information scored even higher.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 12

Community education, expectations, institutional focus, instructional leadership, monitoring of pupil progress, participation

CLANCY, P.L. (1982). 19 Improving Schools and Why. Michigan, Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.

This is the only study which we have found that directly addresses the question: "can community education programs and processes have a positive (or negative) effect on school effectiveness?" By examining data on improving schools, the study hoped to discover whether community education programs were contributing factors. As the study evolved, it broadened the scope to a general investigation of factors contributing to school effectiveness.

The study found 19 elementary schools in Michigan which showed the greatest improvement (from 1976 to 1979) in overall reading and math test scores. Once those "most improving schools" were identified, the study was conducted in three phases.

First, demographic, financial and organizational data were collected on the schools to discover whether there were any clear patterns of similarity between them in terms of size, geographic location, socio-economic context, etc.

Second, inteviews were conducted with superintendents, principals, and teachers from each school or district to identify what factors were leading to improved achievement.

Third, a two day symposium was held in which representatives from each school came to discuss the findings of the interviews and to come up with a "formula for success."

Demographic factors: There were no clear patterns of similarity across the 19 schools. They cut across a range of geographic, socio-economic, size, and per pupil expenditure characteristics.

Oranizational factors: Seven factors contributing to success were mentioned most frequently in the field interviews, and were later corroborated in the two day symposium. These were: (1) High staff communication. (2) An instructional approach based on mastery learning techniques (including diagnostic testing, setting of performance objectives, and frequent monitoring of progress). (3) The principal was a strong leader in the school and was knowledgeable about curricular and instructional matters. (4) The teaching staff was stable, flexible, an skilled in basic teaching techniques. (5) The school communicated well with parents, and the parents were supportive of (if not necessarily involved in) the school. (6) The district superintendent emphasized academic achievement. (7) There were clearly understood expectations of all parties involved -- i.e., parents, teachers, students, and administrators.

Community Education: Although the author's data-base was 19 of the schools showing the highest improvement, the only common background feature among the 19 schools was that 17 out of the 19 were in "community school districts." Note: This is significant because the study design did not seek out community schools. Rather, it sought the most improving schools, and then asked, "are these schools, community schools?" and, if so, "what effect do its community education practices have on that school's ability to improve instruction?"

Although it is difficult to quantify, one implication of this study's findings is that community school practices have enabled the school district to create the base of parent involvement, support and school-parent communication, found to be one of the organizational factors contributing to success.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 13**

Inservice, individualized instruction, institutional focus, instructional leadership

CLARK, D.L., et al. (1980). "Factors Associated with Success in Urban Elementary Schools." Phi Delta Kappan (March).

This secondary analysis screened over 1,200 studies of urban education and found 97 that provided data on "outliers": Schools whose student achievement was above what could be expected in urban poverty settings. The common "success" factors were: (1) instructional leaders who framed goals, set standards, and were entrepreneurial in getting resources for their staff; (2) frequent use of staff development and in-service, tied to the curriculum goals of the school building; (3) clearly stated curriculum goals; and (4) frequent use of individualized instruction.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 14

Instructional leadership

COTTON, K. and W.G. SAVARD (1980). The Principal as Instructional Leader. Research on School Effectiveness Project: Topic Summary Report. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. ED 214 702.

This review of seven studies that specifically tested the hypothesis that "active instructional leadership on the part of principals affect the academic performance of students" summarizes the common behaviors of effective principals. These are: clear communication of expectations to staff, frequent classroom observation, and active involvement in educational and curricular planning.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 15

Ability grouping, cooperative learning

DeVOE, M.W. (1977). "Cooperation as a Function of Self-Concept, Sex and Race." Educational Research Quarterly (summer).

Students with high self-concepts are more likely to compete on academic tasks, while students with low self-concepts are more likely to cooperate, is the conclusion of this experimental study of 290, 10-year olds. Specifically, it found that: (1) Two high self-concept students in the same group will complete with one another rather than cooperate with the group; and (2) Low self-concept students will tend to be more cooperative but will also let high self-concept students turn the cooperative task into a competitive one.

Study is useful in sounding a caveat to the more benign expectations of the cooperative learning concept. It suggests that grouping strategies isolate the high self-concept students (one to a group) so that their competition does not turn the group into a competitive situation.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 16**

Small vs. whole group instruction

DeVRIES, D. (1980). Small Group vs. Individualized Instruction. Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University.

Study compared the performance of nearly 1200 junior high students during a 10 week experiment. Some were taught individually while the rest learned in small groups. Results showed that students in small groups did consistently better on an achievement test and also did better on a self-concept test.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 17

Time-on-task

EBERTS, R. and PIERCE, L. (1982). Time in Classroom: The Effect of Collective Bargaining on the Allocation of Teacher Time. Center for Educational Policy Management, University of Oregon (March).

Eberts and Pierce surveyed the daily activities of more than 3,000 elementary school teachers and principals, in 242 districts, in an effort to determine the effect of collective bargaining on how teacher time is allocated. They found that collective bargaining is associated with a decrease in the amount of time teachers spend on classroom instruction, and concluded that it may therefore have a tendency to reduce student achievement. The authors stress that more research needs to be done in order to determine the actual relationship between teacher instructional time and student achievement.

Eberts and Pierce identify five major areas of responsibility that require teacher time during a typical day. These are: (i) classroom instruction; (ii) preparation for instruction; (iii) administrative and clerical tasks, including staff meetings; (iv) parent contact; and (v) after-school activities.

In their study, they found that collective bargaining tends to reduce instructional time by teachers by 3% (equal to five school days), increase preparation time by 4%, increase administrative and clerical time by 13%, and increase parent contact by 8%. Collective bargaining had no significant correlation with time spent on after school activities. How teachers divide up their time is affected by certain resource constraints, such as the availability of teacher aides, clerical staff, and school administrators. The authors found that having teacher aides is associated with more teacher time spent on administrative tasks, while a greater number of school administrators is associated with increased teacher time on instruction.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 18

Ability grouping, climate, expectations, participation

EDMONDS, R. and J. FREDERICKSON (1979). Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children. ED 170 396.

This is one of the classics of the school effectiveness research literature. Its main message is that differences among students in achievement are not just the result of differences in home background. During the course of this study, it was found that there are schools which are very similar in terms of the low socio-economic level of their students, but which are reaching very different levels of achievement with their students. The researchers ranked twenty schools in Detroit on the basis of their average scores on verbal achievement tests, and classified students according to their race and socio-economic background. They then identified which schools were particularly effective for poor children, and compared the characteristics of these schools to those of less effective schools. They found a number of factors which were consistently associated with effective schools.

Under "teacher attitudes and characteristics," the authors found that more effective teachers disagreed with the idea that disadvantaged children need compensatory programs; instead, these teachers believed that there should be a common standard for all students. Under "school characteristics and curriculum," it was found that schools which did not separate students into many different ability groups were more effective. These schools had fewer special math or English courses and fewer guidance counselors, but did have special education programs. Other factors consistently associated with more effective schools were: use of the National Teacher's Exam in selecting teachers, a larger proportion of parents attending PTA meetings, more regular school attendance by students, an expectation among students that they would continue their schooling, a positive outlook towards their chances in life by students, low racial tension, and a lower incidence of serious theft.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 19**

Individualized instruction, instructional leadership

ERIC/CEM (1980). "Individualized Instruction." Research Action Brief No. 14 (December). ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 94703.

This review of six major research studies on whether and what works in individualized instruction, has identified that:

(1) Individualization is most effective with students at the extremes -- with gifted and with very low ability students.

(2) Factors which promote success in individualized instruction are: Principal leadership, staff commitment and upper level administrative support. Factors which inhibit success are: lack of teacher preparation and lack of community acceptance due to the "back to basics" mood of public opinion.

Grade promotion/retention

ERIC/CEM (1981). "Retain or Promote." Research Action Brief No. 16 (July). ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

This state of the knowledge report reviewed the evidence from 12 of the most significant and oft cited studies on this topic. It found a pattern of contradictory evidence, best summarized in terms of three issues: What is the evidence in favor of retention? What is the evidence against it? And, what evidence is there on who should be retained and how?

Evidence in favor of retention: Retention does not damage the self-concepts of very young children and may even help them. Retention can have positive affective and cognitive consequences when parents actively support the decision. Very young and, for their age level, immature children who are retained make dramatic gains in maturity.

Evidence against retention: Students do not necessarily learn more by repeating a grade. Threats of non-promotion do not motivate students to better performance. Retention policies tend to mirror social inequalities: studies show that among samples of students with equally low achievement level, the best predictor is pupil SES. The lower the status the more likelihood of retention.

Who should be retained and how: First, parent support is vital. Second, retention is most successful in the early years when "immaturity" rather than lack of achievement, was the criteria for retention. Third, only when retained students received special attention did their second year performance improve.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 21**

Grade promotion/retention

FINLAYSON, H.J. (1977). "Non Promotion and Self-Concept Development." Phi Delta Kappan (November).

Does non-promotion adversely affect student self-concept and thus, indirectly, contribute to lower achievement? Finlayson's study says "no."

This is based on a 2-year study of retention and self-concept, using data collected on first graders at the outset of schooling and through their second year. The study compared the self-concepts of regularly promoted students, non-promoted students, and borderline students showing the same characteristics as the non-promoted students.

The findings were: Non-promotion did not create self-concept problems. Self-concept for all three groups rose the first year. In the second year, the non-promoted group continued to increase their self-concept, while scores for borderline and promoted students dropped slightly, but not significantly.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 22

Expectations, instructional leadership, participation

GIGLIOTTI, R. J. and BROOKOVER, W. B. (1975). "The Learning Environment: A Comparison of High and Low Achieving Elementary Schools." *Urban Education*. Vol. X, No. 3, October 1975.

The researchers in this study paired schools that were similar in size, geographic locale (rural, suburban or town), and student socio-economic backgrounds. One school in each pair was high achieving, while the other was relatively low achieving. The study then studied factors that they thought were important in creating a positive learning environment in a school, and compared the high-low achieving pairs to see if the high achieving schools were significantly different from the low achieving schools with respect to these factors.

Information was collected from ten elementary schools: ten principals, 49 teachers, and 1,319 4th, 5th and 6th grade students.

All of the factors they studied showed a significant relationship with student achievement. Among the strongest was student sense of control; that is, students who believe they have control over what happens in their lives achieve more highly than those who feel "victimized" or at the mercy of "the system." The researchers also found strong positive correlations between student sense of control and community support, perceived parent expectations, and perceived teacher expectations. By community support, the researchers meant parental involvement and interest in their children's education and in school issues in general. There was a high relationship between students' *perceptions* of parent and teacher expectations, and students' *aspirations*, as well as their actual achievement. Other factors that were positively correlated with student achievement were: teacher expectations and evaluations, principal expectations and evaluations, perceived principal expectations, teacher press for achievement, and residential stability.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 23

Co-production, inservice, parent education, tutoring: at-home

---

GILLUM, R.M. (1977). "The Effects of Parent Involvement on Student Achievement in Three Michigan Performance Contracting Programs." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, New York, April. ED 144 077.

A comparative study of three Michigan school districts that experimented with parental involvement in performance contracts to improve children's reading skills, found that the district which had the most comprehensive parent program had scored the greatest gains. It concluded:

> For most districts where parent involvement was "pro-forma" and consisted of either filling out a questionnaire or attending large group meetings, the achievement of pupils was similar, but less than the achievement in the school where parents participated in deciding what was taught and had responsibility for working with teachers and children.

One of the three schools stood as having both more parent involvement and greatest gains. The performance contracts were let to private organizations (the "contract" was not between the school and the family) to design different intervention strategies. The most successful school had an intervention strategy which included: (a) inservice training for teachers and administrators in working with parents; (b) training for 40 parent leaders, who then conducted parent education sessions for their peers on the school's educational program, on home-school cooperation, and on at-home reinforcement of student learning and drill activities; and (c) provisions for incentives: both schools an parents received incentive vouchers redeemable for educational materials based on the level of parent involvement; and parents received stipends for attending meetings.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 24**

Time-on-task

GUTHRIE, J.T., et al. (1976). Impacts of Instructional Time in Reading. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center. ED 155 645

Study analyzed data collected by the Educational Testing Service in a study of compensatory reading programs with second graders in 264 schools. The effects of "time" on achievement for those second graders was compared with the effect of time on non-compensatory second and sixth graders.

It found that: Time on task was more important than type of teaching method in raising reading achievement generally. Specifically, children in compensatory programs and in the second grade appeared to benefit more from increased time, than did sixth graders.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 25**

Expectations, individualized instruction, institutional focus, time-on-task

HUIT, W. G. and SEGARS, J. K. (1980). Characteristics of Effective Classrooms. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Citing evidence from a number of studies, this report highlights four main characteristics of effective classrooms:

(1) Teaching is geared to individual considerations -- instruction is based on prior student knowledge (or lack of knowledge) and student learning styles.

(2) The skills and knowledge measured by achievement tests are taught -- attention is paid to content taught and content tested. According to one study, students must be taught at least 60% of test content in order to reach expected achievement levels.

(3) An appropriate amount of time is allowed for learning -- this entails both the amount of time allotted each day for a particular subject, and the amount of time spent actively working on learning tasks. Studies show that student "engaged time" is very important; also, some students require more time than others to master subject matter.

(4) Students are provided with moderate to high success in learning activities -- this hinges on each student's learning style and achievement level, and the mode of instruction.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 26**

Expectations, monitoring pupil progress, small vs. whole group instruction, teacher praise, time-on-task

KASH, M. H. and BOUCH, G. D. (1982). "Teachers" in Improving Educational Standards and Productivity. Edited by H.J. Walberg. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 49-84.

A concise review of the state-of-the-art in "teacher effectiveness" based on an inventory of the research evidence from 27 studies. It reveals evidence showing that there is no one best way, and that different strategies work best with different types of pupils, grade-levels and instructional objectives.

The research evidence shows that:

(1) Time on task is important. Time spent actively engaged in learning is positively correlated with pupil achievement, but longer school days or years have no effect unless the extra time is used on task.

(2) Direct instruction. Works best for learning the most basic of basic skills, at the lower grade levels for pupils of all socio-economic backgrounds and when accompanied by slower pacing of learning objectives direct instruction is more effective with low SES pupils at all age levels.

(3) Expectations and teachers. More teacher praise helps low SES pupils to achieve more, but has no effect on high SES pupils.

(4) Monitoring and feedback. Teacher feedback that is directly related to pupils' performances and products is positively related to achievement for all, both high and low ability pupils.

(5) Grouping and classroom management. Small group instruction is better for basic skills in the 1st and 2nd grades. Whole class instruction works better for math and reading in the upper elementary grades. Pupil peer tutoring and unsupervised individual or small group work are negatively correlated with pupil achievement at the early elementary level.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 27

Co-production, decisionmaking, parent education, tutoring: in-school

KEESLING, J.W., et al. (1980). Parents and Federal Education Programs: The Study of Parent Involvement. Santa Monica: The Systems Development Corp. HEW 300-78-0437.

This was the latest and most comprehensive national study of the parent involvement component in four Federal education programs: Title I, Title VII (Bilingual), Follow Through, and Emergency School Aid Act. Of interest for our Notebook is their findings and conclusions on the consequences of different levels of parent involvement for program "quality," including student achievement.

The general conclusion is that parent involvement does make a difference. Specifically:

(1) Those programs which had more parent involvement (e.g., Follow Through), showed more gains in student achievement.

(2) With respect to kinds of parent involvement, parent education and parents as tutors activities were most often associated with gains in student achievement.

(3) With respect to levels of parent involvement, one kind breeds another. That is, projects which had more participation in decisionmaking also had more parent tutors and volunteers.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 28**

Grade grouping

LINCOLN, R.D. (1982). "Grade Grouping." The School Administrator (May).

This study of grade grouping in a suburban school system, near Hartford (CT), suggests that combining grades will not affect student achievement, at least in the early grades. Test scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) on 400 children who completed second grade over a 3-year period in both single-grade and multi-grade classrooms indicate the following: (1) reading achievement test scores did not vary significantly for children who spent first and second grade in single-grade or multi-grade classrooms; (2) the effect of chronological age (within grade) on reading achievement was not significant, although a narrowly significant difference favoring multi-grade grouping was detected for older children within the grade.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 29**

Ability grouping, grade grouping

MARTIN, L.S., and B.N. PAVAN (1976). "Valid Alternatives to the Traditional Mode of Teaching" in Phi Delta Kappan (January).

A comprehensive review of the evidence on the impact on educational innovations -- grouping, non-graded classrooms, and teach teaching -- concludes that while the results are not Earth shaking or conclusive, the new ideas either alone or in combination do not hurt. Specifically: (1) Heterogeneous grouping without regard to age, sex, or IQ appears to be beneficial. Cognitive outcomes are the same but children get social and "maturational" benefits from heterogeneous arrangements; (2) Students in non-graded situations do as well or better than their peers in graded classrooms. Non-graded groups do as well and often better on tests designed for graded schools; (3) Team teaching: Makes little difference for academic outcomes. It doesn't help. But it doesn't hurt, either.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 30

Behavioral objectives

MELTON, R.F. (1978). "Resolution of Conflicting Claims Concerning the Effect of Behavior Objectives on Student Learning." Review of Educational Research (Spring).

This review of the research suggests that under certain conditions use of behavioral objectives is effective. Specifically: (i) Students must be aware of the objectives and consider them important; (ii) The objectives should be presented during or following the presentation of material rather than preceding the presentation. Otherwise students will concentrate no the objectives to the exclusion or depression of "incidental learning," i.e., learning more than what is specified in the objectives.

Instructional leadership

NEW YORK, STATE OF (1974). School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools. New York State Office of Education. ED 089 211.

This was a comparison of two inner city schools, both matched on demography with one having low student reading achievement, the other having high achievement.

Differences were attributable to administrative practices and instructional leadership. In the successful school, instructional leadership was exercised by an assistant principal with extensive background as a reading specialist. Teacher characteristics -- effectiveness of teaching, training and backgrounds of staff and different types of materials and teaching strategies -- did not differ significantly between the schools.

Attendance, instructional leadership, small vs. whole group instruction, time-on-task

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS (1979). What Works in Reading? School District of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Office of Research and Evaluation.

This study probed 245 variables that might effect reading growth. Data gathered from Philadelphia elementary schools between June 1975 and June 1976 showed the following:

(1) Pupils achieved better in schools in which principals were former reading specialists, and the more the principals observed in the classroom, the better pupils achieved.

(2) The more time a classroom teacher spent away from direct interaction with pupils -- through absence, inservice during class hours, or even by using reading aides -- the less pupils learned.

(3) Teachers who used a combination of whole class instruction and small group instruction while the rest of the class was engaged in silent reading, achieved more learning growth in their pupils.

(4) Pupils with better attendance gained more, as did pupils who attended kindergarten.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 33**

Direct instruction, time-on-task

RICH, H.L. and A.J. BUSH (1978). "The Effect of Congruent Teacher-Student Characteristics on Instructional Outcomes." American Educational Research Journal (Summer).

This study of 20 teachers and 94 fourth, fifth and sixth graders addressed the question: "Do students perform better when their teacher's teaching style is congruent with their own level of development?" Its answer was "yes" and more specifically either direct or indirect teaching styles may be effective depending on the developmental level of the student.

- Direct instruction is more effective with younger, and more immature students. Indirect instruction (which allowed students more freedom) worked best with mature students.
- Where there was congruence between teaching style and student level of development students achieved better and spent more time on task.

Note: In direct instruction, the teacher presents materials and tells students what they ought to know. In indirect teaching, student opinions are sought and discussed.

Climate, expectations, homework, institutional focus, teacher praise, time-on-task

RUTTER, M., et al. (1979). Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effect on Children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

This landmark study was conducted on a cohort of 10-year olds as they progressed through three years of schooling in 12 London inner city secondary schools, and is unique in its investigation of longitudinal impact data.

Information was available on students' ability level, parental occupation, past evaluations of performance by teachers, and family and neighborhood background previous to entering high school. The researchers then examined the subsequent achievement, attendance, employment and delinquency patterns of these students after entering secondary school. They found that there were some schools which should have been alike given the intake data on their students, but were actually quite different in the academic and behavioral results they achieved with students. Some schools were decidedly better at maintaining attendance, improving student behavior, lessening delinquency, and improving academic achievement.

The factors that distinguished these effective schools from the others were; (1) they had more academic emphasis, with higher teacher expectations, checking of homework, work displayed on walls, etc.; (2) instructionally, teachers were more often on-topic, classes started and ended on time, there were fewer interruptions for discipline, etc., (3) rewards as well as punishment were used: in particular, praise was given to all who deserved it, not just a select few; (5) the schools were organized so that there was more advanced planning and collaborative development of curriculum by teachers; and (6) the age of the physical plant did not make a difference, but the neatness (showing a sense of care) did.

The researchers summarize by stressing the importance of "ethos" or climate defined as the combined effects of all these factors. To create an effective school, the sum of all of these parts is greater than the whole.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 35**

Cooperative learning, direct instruction, teacher praise

SILVERNAIL, D.L. (1979). Teaching Styles as Related to Student Achievement: What the Research Says to the Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. ED 177 156.

A state-of-the-knowledge paper on the voluminous research on "teacher effectiveness." What the research says on issues germaine to this notebook is:

(1) Direct Instruction: Indirect instruction is associated with higher student learning than direct teaching, generally. But direct instruction works best for low achievers in the early years.

(2) Praise and Feedback: Young children respond to praise, older children to grades. Minimal praise focused on the task at hand is most effective. Criticism is necessary, but extreme criticism is correlated with low achievement.

(3) Cooperative Learning: Reinforces student self-esteem. But as far as motivation, research favors the use of individual rather than group competition and reward unless the task is one that students cannot do individually.

Time-on-task

STALLINGS, J. (1980). "Allocated Academic Learning Time Revisited, or Beyond Time On Task." Educational Researcher, (December), pp. 11-13.

Much research has been done to determine whether the amount of time spent on a learning task relates to student achievement. This study focused on 43 secondary remedial reading classes in Northern California, and investigated how class time was used over a two year period. Activities were later categorized into "interactional on-task," "noninteractional on-task," and "non-task" activities. For example, reading out loud and discussion were considered interactional, while silent reading was categorized as noninteractional on-task. The researchers then took the results from pre- and post-reading tests to determine what kinds of teaching activities were most associated with gains in student reading levels.

The results showed a strong correlation between interactional on-task activities and improvement in student reading levels. On the other hand, there was a negative correlation between noninteractional on-task activities and student gains. These findings were especially applied to students who had low scores on the initial reading test. The researchers concluded that discussion and review, reading aloud, praise and support during a reading task, and supportive corrective feedback were more effective activities for low-achieving readers than silent reading or written assignments.

A second phase of the study looked at whether training teachers to use the findings from research on effective use of time resulted in higher student achievement. Six workshops were given to one group of teachers, while another group received no further training. Students of the teachers in the experimental group gained six months more in reading on the average than students of teachers in the control group.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 37**

Lesson plans, time-on-task

TALMAGE, H., and S.P. RASHER (1979). "A Study of the Effects of Three Dimensions of Instructional Time on Academic Achievement." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in San Francisco. ED 173 327.

This study adds an interesting wrinkle to the current state of knowledge about "time-on-task," as it relates to the time teachers spend on planning as well as instructing, and as the time on instruction affects high vs. low ability students.

Based on detailed observation and time logs in a nationwide sample of 165 elementary classes, this study found that:

o instructional time did make a difference: more time on task meant better achievement; but

o students with higher prior achievement were less affected by increased time, in fact at the margin more and more time led to decreased achievement; and

o increased teacher planning time appeared to benefit high ability students but hinder low ability students.

That is, "challenging activities" enhance academic achievement in high ability studnts, but tend to lower achievement in low achieving students.

Grade promotion and retention

THOMPSON, S. (1980). Grade Retention and Social Promotion. Burlingame, CA: Association of California School Administrators.

This review of the research indicates that promoted and retained students have similar achievement records in the early years of schooling, but that there is a substantial decrease in retained students' achievement in later grades. Retained students are generally weaker than their peers in personal and social adjustment; and there is support for retaining primary grade students on the basis of immaturity rather than I.Q. Factors found to be linked to positive retention outcomes include a rate of progress less than half of normal, parental attitudes about retention of the child, the grade level at which the child is retained (negative parental attitudes about retention seem to increase in higher grade levels), and the child's emotional stability.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 39

Expectations, teacher praise

TURSMAN, C (1981). Good Teachers: What to Look For. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.

A state-of-the-knowledge report on what teaching practices make a difference concludes the following: (i) Expectations: an essential characteristic is what the author and others have called "academic press," (ii) Time-on-task; (iii) Teacher Cues and Feedback -- how teachers structure lessons and give cues accounts for 14% of the variance in student achievement -- good teachers provide precise feedback about mistakes; (iv) Teacher Praise -- best if used sparingly, and (v) Grouping -- makes no difference.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 40**

Decisionmaking, home-school communication

WAGENAAR, T.C. (1977). "School Achievement Level vis-a-vis Community Involvement and Support." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (September). ED 146 111.

Although limited to a single midwestern city, this is one of the most comprehensive and conceptually sophisticated attempts to investigate the impact on achievement of various kinds of citizen and parent involvement.

The criterion or dependent variable was school building averages of pupil reading and math test scores. This was designed to test the effect of the entire school's performance rather than that of individual pupils. In this way, the study could investigte the effects of participation on the achievement levels of the children of participants. The study then investigated correlations between performance at 135 schools and levels and types of "community involvement and support" at each of the schools.

"Community involvement and support" was measured by 29 separate indicators encompassing a continuum of various kinds of parent and citizen involvement. This continuum included:

(i) Mobilization of community resources: fund raising and political support, including voter turnout and support for school bond issue elections.

(ii) Home-school communications: opportunities to participate in school activities; use of school facilities by community groups; number of parents attending school meetings; level of contact between teacher and principals, and parents.

(iii) Participation in decisionmaking: the role of parents and citizens in school policy decisions, such as selecting curricula, hiring teachers, setting discipline procedures, and allocating the budget.

Controlling for SES (in order to eliminate the class bias in both student achievement and levels of participation), the study found that, generally, involvement does make a difference: schools with higher achievement are more open to parent and community involvement while more "closed" schools have lower achievement levels and less community support. But, not all kinds of involvement make a difference. More specifically:

(a) The highest correlation was with community support and fundraising, attendance at school meetings, and number of school functions involving the community.

(b) The next highest correlation was with community group use of facilities, followed by the level and number of parent-school contacts.

(c) Citizen participation in policy decisionmaking was not found to be related to achievement.

A4: RESEARCH THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE **RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 41**

Ability grouping, climate, expectations, individualized instruction, institutional focus, instructional leadership, monitoring of pupil progress

---

WEBER, G. (1971). Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. CBE Occasional Papers, No. 18. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education. ED 057 125.

This is an earlier classic in the school effectiveness literature. It employed a strategy -- the search for "outliers" (poor neighborhood schools whose students achieved better than statistically expected) followed by an inductive study of what school practices are common in all those outliers -- that became more or less standard in the subsequent "school effects" research.

Weber found four outliers: two in Manhattan, one in Los Angeles, and one in Kansas City. All served poor children. Each had reading achievement medians in the third grade that equaled or exceeded the national norm.

After studying these schools, Weber found eight characteristics they had in common: (i) Strong instructional leadership: in three cases it was the principal, in one case it was the area superintendent. In all cases, the leader "specifically led the beginning grades reading program;" (ii) High expectations; (iii) A "good atmosphere" meaning a climate of order, sense of purpose, and pleasure in learning; and (iv) Strong emphasis on reading including (v) having additional personnel, (vi) use of phonics; and (vii) frequent individualization; and (viii) careful evaluation of student progress.

PART B: PRACTICES

This section contains one to two page profiles of 47 school improvement projects in 36 communities in 21 states.

These profiles resulted from three waves of mail surveys conducted by IRE: in November and December of 1983, and in the early and late spring of 1984. Altogether, we made over 300 queries and received 62 responses and returns. Readers will note that some of the projects profiled were just beginning at the time of our query. The information about program and contact people we list is current for the 1983-84 school year.

We selected and profiled projects which met at least one of two criteria.

(1) They exemplified the implementation of the effective schools model as developed in the research of Ron Edmonds and Larry Lezotte, and/or

(2) They were otherwise focused on improving basic skills instruction for all children and involved the community in that effort.

Our focus was limited to local school and school district projects, and not to state education agency efforts.* Our focus was also limited to the elementary level, although in the course of our surveys, we did receive unsolicited information on high school level improvement. The latter are contained in a set of practices profiles in Appendix B, below.

We used a snowballing information gathering rather than a sampling procedure.

First, we queried participants from a national conference on citizen participation and school improvement, which the Institute for Responsive Education had convened in St. Louis in the spring of 1982. Over 300 people met at that conference, including school administrators, state education agency officials, researchers and community organization leaders. Our query asked each to either describe a local project in which they were involved, or to let us know of other projects.

---

* For a good source of information on this topic, see: Allan Odden and Van Dougherty, State Programs for School Improvement: A 50 State Survey. Report No. 182-3. Available from the Publications Desk, Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295, (303) 830-3600.

This first wave of responses was the core of our sample, and produced a set of other places and projects to query. Meanwhile, we had also undertaken an extensive search and survey of the literature -- academic, professional and popular. This search and survey also yielded clues to places that seemed to have improvement projects underway.

We pursued those clues, and in each successive set of queries respondents often provided us with further clues about other projects. The result is not, therefore, a statistical sample of school improvement projects. Nor can we claim to be comprehensive since we did not query every school district in the country.

The 47 project profiles do, however, provide readers with a sampler -- and perhaps most importantly with a set of leads to contact people responding to our surveys and to case-study literature describing projects -- of the different efforts that have and are being undertaken to improve schools.

Some of the diversity of the local efforts can be captured in the following overview.

(1) Of the 47 projects, 17 follow the Ron Edmonds-Larry Lezotte school effectiveness model (see Profile No.'s 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16-18, 21, 24-25, 29-32, 46).

(2) Twenty-six out of the 47 projects provide for parent and citizen involvement in decisionmaking; twenty-three explicitly mobilize direct parent involvement in delivering instruction as part of their strategy for improvement (see the Topical Index entry "Co-production" for a listing of those project profiles).

(3) While the majority of the projects, 34 out of 47, were sponsored and initiated by school departments, two were initiated by philanthropic foundations (Profile No.'s 10 and 33); eight were conducted in collaboration with colleges and universities (No.'s 4, 18, 19, 22, 25, 29, 37, 38); and three were either initiated or co-sponsored by citizens organizations (No.'s 14, 32, and 42).

(4) Community education was an explicit component of seven projects (No.'s 1-2, 8, 24, 28, 37 and 38).

Final note: The project profiles are listed alphabetically by place-name, state and then locality. Recognizing that "the best resource is the next locally available one," that same model of listing will be adopted in Part C, below, where we provide abstracts of resources -- organizations and people.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 1**

CA CHULA VISTA LAUDERBACH COMMUNITY SCHOOL

CHRISPEELS, J. (1984). "Parent/Community Action in Building Effective Schools," in Citizen Action in Education X, no. 2 (April), p. 1 and 3 and 5.

Forty-two percent of Lauderbach's students do not speak English when they enter school, yet by the end of the 6th grade, 66% of the students read from English texts and attain mean scores at or above grade level. A school improvement process has been implemented at Lauderbach for the past eight years. The principal has been the leader in involving the community with the school. Eighty percent of Lauderbach's parents attend parent-teacher conferences twice a year those parents who do not attend get a home visit by a teacher. Parent members of the school site council, a committee consisting of equal numbers of parents and community members and the principal and the staff have a strong voice in defining the school's goals. These are then reviewed annually by the council, and the larger parent body is surveyed. Objectives are formulated for all children in the areas of reading, language arts, arithmetic, social studies, multi-cultural education, science, and fine arts. During the school year the council reviews programs in each area, indicated by standardized test scores. In addition, the community school progam is run to support the regular school program. It has organized child care for parent education programs, and a senior citizen volunteer program to provide kindergarten children with tutoring in basic skills.

For further information, see Resource People Abstract No. 6: Janet Chrispeels, in Part C4, below.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, ciproduction, decisionmaking, home-school communication, parent education, tutoring: in-school, volunteers	Climate, community education, expectations, instructional leadership

---

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 2**

CA LOS ANGELES LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Floraline I. Stevens
Director, Research and Evaluation
Los Angeles Unified School District
Post Office Box 3307
Los Angeles, California 90057 (213) 625-6207

In February 1982, the Los Angeles Unified School District published an outline of its "Basic Activities," designed to be a "bible" of district goals and principals. The five goals are: (1) improve student achievement; (2) improve the environment in which teaching and learning occur; (3) strengthen the support from parents and the community at large and its leaders for the school program; (4) improve staff morale; and (5) improve relationships and credibility with state and Federal legislators.

Under each of these goals, the superintendent's office provided detailed activity descriptions, implementation dates, and position responsibility for each activity. The district periodically surveys teachers, principals, and parents to ensure that these activities remain important and "operational."

For more information about parent involvement, contact: Dr. Robert Martin, Los Angeles Unified School District, 450 Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90012, (213) 625-6725.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, advocacy: monitoring, decisionmaking	Climate, institutional forces

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 3**

CA LOS ANGELES LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT PROJECT

NIEDERMEYER, F. and S. YELLON (1981)l. "Los Angeles Aligns Instruction with Essential Basic Skills," Educational Leadership. May, pp. 618-620.

With the collaboration of the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) for Educational Research and Development, the school district initiated the "Curriculum Alignment Project" to help teachers align their instruction with district objectives and assessment, so that students could master, at each grade level, those reading, written composition, and mathematics skills that are considered essential. Targeted at racially isolated minority schools, the Curriculum Alignment Project is intended to: (1) eliminate underplacement and underpacing of students; (2) keep instruction focused on essential skills; (3) help establish priorities and manage time accordingly; and (4) help clarify school objectives.

The curriculum-alignment process involves school staff in "sharing, planning, implementing, evaluating, and designing strategies that will enable students to acquire the essential skills." Teachers play the major role in the curriculum alignment process. At staff development sessions, conductd by the school principal and a school-designated, curriculum-alignment coordinator (with support from SWRL staff), teachers receive materials to assist them in developing continuity among grade levels.

1. Class profile sheets provide a unique way of showing the strengths and weaknesses of an incoming class.

2. Class progress sheets serve as a checklist of grade-level skills to be covered in reading, mathematics, and written composition.

3. Class instructional planning sheets list and describe skills to be covered in a particular grade level and show where skills appear in texts.

Topic Descriptors: Curriculum alignment, institutional focus, time-on-task, monitoring pupil achievement

4. Correlation charts provide a page-by-page description of skills covered in a particular textbook series and list the grade level of skill assessment.

The principal and the curriculum-alignment coordinator use a Coordinator's Guide, which includes presentation guides on staff-development topics; SWRL and district-prepared overhead transparencies, and additional materials such as discussion guides, worksheets, and reference materials.

In 1981, participating teachers said that the project helped them to:

- establish instructional goals based on assessment scores
- identify improvements in instruction needed to increase low assessment scores
- share ideas and teaching skills
- clarify what essential skills are taught in textbooks used in the classroom
- set priorities on what students should be taught in order to learn essential skills
- make more time available for direct instruction of essential skills
- teach more of the essential skills

For further information, contact SWRL Educational Research Development, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720, (213) 598-7661.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 4

CA LOS ANGELES UCLA "SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP"

Dr. Paul Heckman
The Laboratory in School and Community Education
Graduate School of Education
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024 (213) 206-1134

The "Partnership" was begun in 1980, when the Dean of the Graduate School of Education invited a number of school and county superintendents to discuss current issues in education. A confederation was formed, of school districts, community colleges, and county officer. Activities range from quarterly meetings of the chief executive officers to meetings of teachers, principals, central office staff and board members, where topics such as demographic changes, the uses of technology and effective schools research are discussed.

"The Partnership" has been involved in several projects in middle schools. Researchers and teachers at one school have been developing a system of cognitive learning to assist children who were falling behind. At another, a team of teachers together with administrators and specialists have been working to develop a non-graded team approach to early childhood and lower elementary education. A further liaison through the Partnership has linked the UCLA Graduate School of Education with school staff at the 4th an 5th grade levels. A research project is being carried out which centers on the problem of poor learning motivation and developmental issues.

In another site, UCLA is involved with a district-wide project to train master teachers in a series of weekend training workshops. Teachers participating in the series will serve as master teachers for the district and share their knowledge with other staff members.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Decisionmaking, advisory council	Cooperative learning, community education, grade: grouping, school-university collaboration

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

The project is also studying the use of heterogeneously grouped classes in academic subjects at the high school level. They are testing the theory that low achievers need not be grouped homogeneously if the teacher is trained in effective instruction techniques and is able to alter approaches as needed. The goal of this project is to show that more growth in learning will take place among learners who have the stimulus of a heterogeneous setting (and that teachers can feel at ease if they have the command of a variety of instructional strategies).

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 5**

CA MILPITAS MILPITAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

"Milpitas Shows Large Gains," in You and the Schools, IV, No. 1, May 1983, pp. 1 and 4. Information Project on Education: Network, 810 Miranda Green, Palo Alto, California 94306, (415) 948-7425

Milpitas began its school improvement plan in 1978. It was a district-wide effort which changed loosely coupled schools into a tightly coordinated curricular system. The district's Community Board Advisory Council (CBAC) recommended district goals to the Board of Education after a thorough review of school effectiveness findings. The 25 member advisory council is composed of parent representatives from the general community.

The district's instructional objectives, materials, strategies and assessment instruments were linked together, and an intensive staff development program was undertaken to support the district's policies. These have been a success. Test scores have risen, both in the CAP reading test and mathematics, reflecting the greater emphasis on improving the instructional skills of teachers and principals.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking	Curriculum alignment, in-service, institutional focus

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 6

CA SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS JOHNSON ACADEMIC ACADEMY

Johnson Academic Academy
1355 Felton Road
San Diego, California 92114

The San Diego City School District and Johnson Academy made it their policy to assign homework daily to all students, Monday through Friday. Students in the primary grades will be expected to spend a minimum of 45 minutes to one hour per day on homework assignments. The Johnson School sends an explanatory note to each parent about the importance of homework and asks their co-operation in encouraging the child to work. If the child is seen to be having problems, the parent is requested to contact the child's teacher. A list of books appropriate to reading levels is sent home to parents. Each child is required to read and report on at least one book a month. Verification is determined by parent signature. District-provided cards are used for record-keeping. Parents of students not proficient in independent reading are requested to read to those students nightly.

Every three weeks, the parents receive a progress report on their child's work. They get the papers from the preceeding three weeks' assignments, are asked to review them, sign the progress report, and return it to the teacher.

The principal sends a booklet explaining the Johnson discipline code to parents, and asks them to return a tear-off sheet to the child's classroom teacher with their signature. The school also distributes a booklet, The Johnson School Code of Conduct, which explains to parents their responsibility toward the child in matters of homework, punctuality, attitude and attire.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Co-production, home-school communication, tutoring: at-home	Climate, homework, institutional focus

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 7**

CA SAN DIEGO

SAN DIEGO COUNTY
EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Dave Meaney
San Diego County Office of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, California 92111

The San Diego Cunty Office of Education has developed an assessment process for evaluating school effectiveness using the Connecticut State Department of Education Survey of School Effectiveness and the Connecticut Interview for Effective Schools. These instruments are used with teachers and administrators. A locally developed parent survey is used to obtain parents' opinions.

Classroom assessments are conducted and a time-on-task average from the school is recorded. Other interviews and surveys are utilized for achievement trends and monitoring patterns of groups of students. From this material, a final school profile is produced.

Once a commitment is made on the part of the staff toward a collaborative improvement effort, a planning committee meets with county staff to develop an action plan. The process of implementing the plan is closely monitored. Since it is a long-range process, the end results of significant student achievement gains are invisible for two or more years into the effort.

The staff surveys are useful for awakening consciousness of a clear school mission and bringing out differences in the respondent's views. Some, for example, questioned if there were specific objectives in the areas of language arts for all grade levels, while others felt that the district report cards provided the list of skills to be accomplished at each grade level. In the matter of school climate, some concern was expressed about inconsistency in discipline rulings and differing interpretations of regulations among teachers.

Topic Descriptors: Community surveys, curriculum alignment, homework, institutional focus, time-on-task

Some of the recommendations that were made as a result of the surveys were:

(a) Create a school mission statement to develop a school plan to address priority areas.

(b) Clarify school homework policy and communicate it to staff, student and parents.

(c) Align curriculum with testing programs and examine trends in testing reported time-on-task data.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 8**

CA SAN DIEGO COUNTY CENTER FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Janet Chrispeels
Center for Community Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, California 92111

Juanita Carney and Janet Chripeels served as interns for the San Diego County Department of Education, Center for Community Education, for six months, in order to explore ways in which community education may be linked to school improvement programs. Through a survey sent to school improvement program schools, they developed a detailed questionnaire to obtain information about the range of activities in each school and to identify the many community agencies utilized. They organized a workshop to share the results of the survey, which was rated as valuable by all who attended.

The researchers recommended that more workshops should be held for training school councils and school improvement coordinators, and they should be coordinated with other major school districts in the country. School-based community education and the school improvement program were shown to have commonalities, including the need for a representative council with decision-making power. School-based community education includes the features of school improvement, with the following characteristics added:

(a) A relationship is developed between the community and school through shared decisionmaking

(b) People of all ages are served, in keeping with the resources and wishes of the neighborhood

(c) A neighborhood school is a multi-agency service delivery system, through cooperative inter-agency agreements and multi-agency planning.

A collaboration of a school improvement program and school-based community education would take into consideration the

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking	Community education, community surveys

following factors:

(a) If a school is funded, total school/community involvement in writing the plan, implementing the activities, and evaluation is needed. School site members should represent a cross-section of the community.

(b) School improvement funds would encourage community concerns through the schools by cooperation with industry, private and government agencies, boards, and other businesses.

(c) School boards, administrators, teachers and all staff will need to understand the benefits of community involvement and must be trained for new and expanded roles. This would necessitate creating training packets, establishing a network of trainers, developing training for an entire school site council and organizing parent participation classes.

(d) New techniques will have to be developed as school and community share facilities. Staff commitment, space usage and conflicts, liability problems, use of supplies and energy are among the matters that need to be addressed.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 9**

CA SAN JOSE SANTA CLARA COUNTY
SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAM

Marsha Weil, Director
School Effectiveness Program
Institute for Educational Leadership
100 Skyport Drive, MC 237
San Jose, California 95115 (408) 946-6537

The school effectiveness program in Santa Clara County is intended to uncover the policies, practices, and behaviors that account for school effectiveness.* The program, begun in 1980, worked for two years to determine the important behavioral aspects of the accepted effective schools variables. They postulated that one key effectiveness variable was "academic press" -- the degree to which environmental forces press for student achievement on a school-wide basis. These forces are composed of school policies, practices, expectations, norms, and rewards.

According to the researchers, school purpose is the primary policy area. School level policies that communicate high expectations can be created in the areas of school climate, homework and testing. School grouping is improved as a method for conveying academic expectation when it is changed from ability grouping to "mastery learning" -- administered in the belief that all students can achieve grade-level objectives.

Other school level policies that increase "academic press" are those that protect instructional time. Clear and consistently enforced school policies on attendance and tardiness, and the minimization of interruptions have all been shown to be effective. The study has shown most teacher practices and behaviors are equal in importance to administrative practices at the district level. Their model of "academic press" relies on an integrated policy-practice-behavior framework.

---

* MURPHY, J.F., et al. (1982). "Academic Press: Translating High Expectations into School Policies and Classroom Practices," in Educational Leadership (December).

Topic Descriptors: Ability grouping, climate, expectations, homework, institutional focus, mastery learning, monitoring pupil progress, testing, time-on-task

---

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 10**

CT HARTFORD HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mary Wilson, Coordinator
Hartford Effective Schools Initiative
Hartford Public Schools,
294 High Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103 (203) 722-8866

In a three-year project funded by the Aetna Life & Casualty Foundation, the Hartford Public Schools' Effective Schools Initiative will focus on three schools beginning in December of 1984. The stated goal of the project is to help all students achieve mastery of the basic skills and achieve maximum development of their educational potential. The objectives of the project are set forth for principals, teachers, and students, as well as for parents and community members.

Principals will: (1) provide a safe and orderly school environment; (2) develop a clearly articulated school mission; (3) provide instructional leadership; and (4) develop a climate of high expectations.

Teachers will: (1) increase the time students are engaged in planned learning activities; (2) utilize effective instructional strategies; and (3) utilize multiple assessment methods in frequently monitoring student progress.

Students will achieve grade level mastery of the basic skills.

Parents will reinforce the school progam with monitored learning activities at home.

Community and corporate leaders will serve as resource persons for project implementation.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking	Climate, expectations, institutional focus, time-on-task, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress

The project will be evaluated through pre- and post-testing of students' basic skills, competency assessment of principals, competency assessment of teachers, self-assessment of principals, reaction forms by project staff, parents, community members, and corporate leaders assessing their own involvement and conferences with participants.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 11

CT VERNON VERNON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Dr. Albert J. Kirkin, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent
Vernon Public Schools
Corner of Park and School Streets
Vernon, Connecticut 06066 (203) 872-7361

The Connecticut school effectiveness plan began in 1981-82 in the Vernon, Connecticut elementary schools. The seven characteristics of an effective school defined for this project were:

(a) A safe, orderly environment
(b) A clear school mission
(c) Instructional leadership by a strong principal
(d) High expectations
(e) Basic skills concentration
(f) Frequent monitoring by testing
(g) Parent involvement

The process for school improvement was identified as: Dialogue, Commitment, Assessment, Action-Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation. It is a voluntary process which helps a principal and faculty examine certain characteristics coincident with student learning, to develp an action plan and initiate long-term change in a school-based setting. Parents were contacted by the initial survey regarding the school and its programs.

Contact for more information on parent involvement: Edward Litke, Maple Street School, Maple Street, Vernon, Connecticut 06066, (203) 875-5680.

Participation Descriptors

Advisory councils
decisionmaking

Topic Descriptors

Climate, expectations,
institutional focus,
instructional leadership,
monitoring of pupil progress
school-business partnerships

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 12**

FL MIAMI DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. G. Holmes Braddock, and
Mrs. Ethel Beckham
1410 N.E. Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132 (305) 350-3868

The Dade County Public Schools have a 91.26% overall attendance rate and have had a steep rise in the number of students succeeding on the college-level advance placemente in the AP examinations. Local school officials attribute much of this to strong community support, inlcuding an extensive network of Citizens' Advisory Committees in the more than 200 schools. This network runs the school volunteer program, the Dade Partners Program, the Parent-Teacher and the Parent-Teacher-Student associations which operate at the school and district levels. Its members are representatives from all community groups. Citizens are also encouraged to join special citizen task force groups and Vocational Craft Advisory committees. One of the most prominent school-business programs is Dade Partners. It has expanded to include 450 businesses, civic clubs, local governments and other groups. Most Partners work in a one-to-one relationship with the school to provide employment or training opportunities for students, or sponsor a student intern in a leadership development effort.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, advocacy: general, decisionmaking	Climate, expectations, institutional focus instructional leadership monitoring pupil progress school-business partnership

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 13**

GA ATLANTA ED S. COOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The Ed S. Cook Elementary School was a dilapidated building serving students from mostly low-income homes. The median test scores had been below average for the past decade or more. After Betty Strickland took the position of principal in 1977, her first objective was to improve the building's appearance. The entire school was renovated, including the roof and interior furnishings. A two-week staff development workshop was held during the summer of 1977. Fourteen teachers were given 50 hours of increment credit and a subsequent salary increase. Team feeling was increased. Parents were encouraged to meet directly with the principal each week for three months, to express their frustrations. The principal joined a tenants' association and attends meetings and other community activities. She visited students at home, if necessary.

Monday morning assemblies were instituted to convey the high expectations of the administration. Such meetings also provided teachers with an extra planning period.

An extensive volunteer program was begun, using volunteers from churches in the community, private schools and universities, to give help in reading and math. Volunteers also conduct drama groups and motivational reading activities. Eighth grade students came in to tutor students and peer tutoring within the school is used as well. Additional activities, such as a school garden, have been added, and the school sponsors neighborhood clean-up projects. Activities are geared to increase students' feelings of success. The students have increased attendance and show improved academic achievement.

For further information see Resource People Abstract No. 19: Betty Strickland, in Part C4, below.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Coproduction, home-school communication, tutoring: in-school, volunteers	Climate, expectations, inservice, instructional leadership, lesson plans

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILES NO. 14**

IL CHICAGO CHICAGO SCHOOL WATCH

Don Moore
Designs for Change
220 State Street, Suite 1616
Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 922-0317

Chicago School Watch is a project of Designs for Change, a non-profit research and child advocacy organization, and is dedicated to strengthening parent councils in Chicago and Illinois. School Watch organizes, trains, and advises parent groups. The membership is open. For School Watch members, the organization provides a review of the latest effective schools research, helps the parents to evaluate their school using a "School Watch" report card and to design an improvement plan. School Watch has been organizing and advising parents in six of the twenty districts in the Chicago school system for the past year. Based on this experience, School Watch has put together a handbook for nationwide use which will be available at the end of 1984.

They currently distribute a bilingual packet which explains the ten factors crucial in making schools effective. Each "ingredient" has a separate sheet and explains the importance of principal leadership, time-on-task, basic skills and parent involvement, staff expectations, student attendance, school climate, emphasis on reading, clear school goals, carefully designed special programs, and frequent monitoring of pupil progress. Materials are available in English and Spanish.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advocacy: monitoring	Attendance, climate, curriculum alignment, expectations, institutional focus, instructional leadership, time-on-task

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 15**

IL CHICAGO WOODSON SCHOOL

LEVINE, D.U. and J. STARK (1982). "Instructional and Organizational Arrangements That Improve Achievement in Inner City Schools," in Educational Leadership (December).

CMLRP (Chicago Mastery Learning Reading Program) is a system that is focused on learning of specific essential skills. CMLRP is implemented in schools with building level staff development, where the teachers meet weekly for instructional decisionmaking in a given grade. It is used in both regular and parallel classes (for the lowest achieving students) and improves the grade to grade continuity of instruction through curriculum alignment.

CMLRP establishes a district wide list of essential skills for each grade and a series of criteria-referenced tests for assessing mastery of those skills. Data is thus provided for diagnosing of prescribing solutions to various learning problems. Individual teacher planning is made more efficient and focuses supervision on concrete questions and data instead of on generalized issues.

As part of CMLRP, parents are asked to notify the administration as to the efficacy of certain homework assignments. They receive booklets describing and explaining CMLRP, and mailings showing the progress of their children's performance on basic skills.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Co-production, home-school communication	Curriculum alignment, expectations, homework, institutional focus, lesson plans, mastery learning, monitoring pupil progress, testing

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 16

IL CHICAGO EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROJECT

EUBANKS, E.E. and D.U. LEVINE (1983). "A First Look At Effective School Projects at Inner City Schools." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City.

The Effective Schools Project (ESP) was initiated during the summer of 1981. Forty-five schools were selected. All were predominantly low income and minority.

A week-long planning workshop was held at the beginning for teams of principals and teachers, where effective schools research was discussed and needs assessment training given. Principals then developed building action plans for the 1981-82 year. These delineated 120 major educational program needs and 164 "supportive objectives" in areas such as parent involvement and improving the school environment. The schools received funding from state Title I money and ESAA grants. During the 1981-82 year, schools undertook the following actions: increasing time-on-task, employment of a teacher for art, science, music and social studies, in-service training, and employing a full-time person to work with staff in improving reading. Eighteen of the schools held summer sessions in 1982.

For 1982-83, an instrument was developed for reviewing building-level action plans. The monitoring is done by a former principal and a staff of specialists, and superintendents, personnel and staff from the ESP schools. ESP schools registered higher academic gains than other schools in the city.

For further information, please see Resource People Abstract No. 25: Daniel Levine, in Part C4, below.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Co-production	Behavioral objectives, needs assessment, instructional leadership, time-on-task, inservice training

In addition to ESP, there were recent system-wide policies that directly influenced the schools. A code of discipline was developed and put into ues, reading was to be taught an hour each day, teacher evaluation became more specific, and the Chicago Mastery Learning Reading Program was implemented in K-8.

ME AUBURN AUBURN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Roy Loux
Superintendent of Auburn Public Schools
Auburn, Maine 04210

As of 1982, a five year plan for the implementation of the Auburn Effective Schools Program was endorsed by the Auburn School Committee. The plan is an effort to determine where the school system will be five years from now, using current research to develop a direction.

The central office has the responsibility to develop publicly stated learning outcomes for all students in all subjects. Based on these, a criteria-referenced assessment system which documents, records, reports, and awards credit for academic attainment will be devised and implemented. At the school level, each prncipal will be evaluated as to whether he or she can maintain high standards and establish an orderly school climate. Each school is to develop a systematic process for planning and providing instruction and for engaging each student until the desired learning outcome is achieved. For those students who have not reached the expected outcome through the first method, alternative approaches must be devised. Teachers are to have a specific set of classroom responsibilities, including upholding the school-wide standard of discipline and making sure there is maximum time spent on "tasks" and direct supervision of the learning process.

The Auburn School System is currently, for the 1984-85 school year, developing and reviewing learning outcomes in English, reading, writing, spelling, foreign languages, and industrial arts. A criterion referenced testing system is being developed in conjunction with all of these. All activities are geared to standardizing goals and objectives in all schools throughout the system.

Topic Descriptors: Curriculum alignment, institutional focus, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress, time-on-task

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 18**

MD BALTIMORE BALTIMORE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOSSONE, R.M. (1982). What Works in Urban Schools: Proceedings of the Conference of the University/Urban Schools Task Force, pp. 78-95, ED 216 052.

The Baltimore Public School System had seen an annual decline in test scores by all grade levels as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills as of 1975. In response, the system instituted "Grade Level Expectancies" with accompanying orientation and staff development activities. Proficiency tests were developed for those expectancies for grades 1-9 in writing, 3-8 in math, and 3-9 in reading. These tests were designed to isolate these skills with discrete questions on each skill and to diagnose academic deficiencies. Based upon the results of those tests, courses were designed to offer remediation. A reading laboratory was created for intensive instruction to be used instead of an elective. For math remediation, courses individualized for student needs were used to attain basic proficiency in mathematics.

Teachers were moved from elective areas into remedial areas, and the school system hired additional reading teachers. Some elementary teachers who were surplus were retained and assigned to the secondary level. The school system was assisted in this retraining effort by a local university.

In addition to school-based supervision, a system-wide program of superivision was provided by the central office instructional division. Direct classroom observation of staff and one-to-one supervision were practiced. At the secondary level, educational specialists gave assistance to junior and senior high school teachers. Teaching clusters at the upper elementary level were created to provide more specialized, technical supervision in content areas.

Elementary school grades are now based on a composite of teacher grades and proficiency test scores. Any student scoring less than 70% must be given remediation. At the secondary level,

Topic Descriptors: Curriculum alignment, expectations, grade-promotion and retention, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress, school-university collaboration the passing of subjects and proficiency tests were also tied to promotional considerations.

The passing of all proficiency tests as a graduation requirement went into effect in Spring 1979. A promotion committee was formed at each school to aid in promotion/graduation decisions (and take mitigating circumstances into account).

The ten-year decline in test scores was halted in 1976-77. There has been an accelerated rise of scores each year, and as of 1981, the scores of all grade levels were beyond that established by the norm.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 19**

MD ELKTON CECIL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. Peter L. McCallum
Specialist in Instruction - Elementary Education
Cecil County Public Schools
Booth Street Center
Elkton, Maryland 21921 (301) 398-0400, Ext. 256

The Cecil County Public Schools began a School Volunteer Program in 1974. The primary purpose of volunteers was to assist teachers, administrators, and other school personnel in helping children become more successful learners. Volunteers are recruited by the use of letters, posters, sign-up tables at special events, and appeals to community organizations.

The Cecil County Public Schools caused a bill to be introduced in the Maryland legislature which resulted in the legal basis for volunteer aides. Under Maryland's new state law, volunteer aides have liability insurance coverage and workmen's compensation coverage. Parents served on the committee to write the "Handbook for Staff," which is aimed at both volunteers and teachers. In this book, the factors for a successful volunteer program are listed. They include recommendations to plan and provide training that is specific to the jobs that are assigned volunteers and remarks that school personnel may also need training in how to best use volunteer services.

Some of the volunteer activities are: assisting in test administration, reinforcing reading skills, assisting foreign speaking students, assisting individuals with small group instruction. Non-instructional activities include: record keeping, child care services, taping and cataloging materials and preparing overhead transparencies.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, coproduction, decisionmaking, tutoring: in-school, volunteers	Small group instruction, testing

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 20**

MD INDIAN HEAD CHARLES COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Kenneth H. Rineaman, Principal
Matthew Henson Middle School
Route 1, Box 122
Indian Head, Maryland 20640 (301) 375-8550

In a project called SITIP (School Improvement Through Instructional Processes), the Johns Hopkins Team Learning Project began work in 1980-81 in two schools. Effectiveness was defined as higher grades in core subject areas. Measures of progress used were classroom-based statistics. Parents were involved in monitoring and evaluating the project.

The technique features Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD). Students are assigned to four or five member heterogeneous learning teams. Each week, a teacher introduces new material in a lecture or discussion. The team members then study worksheets on the material. They may work problems one at a time with a teammate, discuss it as a group, or quiz each other by turns. Team members are told that they are not finished studying until they and their teammates are sure that they understand the material. The students take quizzes singly and the quiz scores are combined into team scores by the teacher. The teams with the highest team scores are recognized in a weekly class newsletter. Using this method students aid one another in learning basic skills and have begun to view learning as a cooperative activity.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advocacy, monitoring	Cooperative learning, school-university collaboration

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 21**

MD ROCKVILLE MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Joy Frechtling
Division of Instructional Evaluation
Montgomery County Public Schools
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20854 (301) 279-3595

After a decision by the school board, the Committee for Assessing School Effectiveness drew up two plans (to be used concurrently) to assess the schools in Montgomery County. This proposal was presented to the superintendent of schools in November of 1983. The Committee suggested that the suprintendent appoint an advisory group of senior staff members and principals to assist with implementation for five years.

The first plan was called the "internal model." Building based, it dictates that staff be committed to high achievement test expectations. School staff would take part in in-service training and improve the internal management system. Each school would be evaluated on seven effectiveness characteristics by monitoring teams and school staff in self-study. Each characteristic would have indicators relating to specifics such as test score data and school environment.

The second plan, the "external model," is designed to improve the academic performance of students over the whole district, while ensuring that minorities get needed attention. This model is based on a principal internship program in which staff members who were being trained for principal positions were assigned to upgrade the schools of Richland District One, of Columbia, South Carolina (see Project Profile No. 35, below). In this model, every school is called upon to strive for high quotas on six performance factors (test scores in reading/language arts and math; teacher and student attendance; parent and student satisfaction). To be considered effective, a school must have met predetermined criteria in at least four areas, two of these being test score areas. When a school was able to do this it received a grant of two dollars per student for every goal achieved. The school would also have gotten a flag, to signify

Topic Descriptors: Expectations, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil programs

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 22**

MA CAMBRIDGE PROJECT STILE

Project STILE - Student/Teacher Interactive Learning Environment) is an in-service teacher training progam that was developed at MIT in 1982. It works to improve the learning environment by showing how teacher expectations affect student achievement. This approach is based on the research indicating that teacher expectations affect student performance independent of any actual difference in skill levels. STILE teachers attend a series of workshops where they learn about the importance of teacher expectations. They then observe each other's actual perfomance. Each observer makes a profile of the expectations communicated by the instructor using a special observation form which evaluates teacher response to student answers. Afterwords, the teacher and the observer meet to discuss the results and formulate an improvement plan.

Project STILE can be adopted to involve teachers only, or to involve students as participant observers. They are trained to give specific responses to the teachers and to discuss in detail the learning process as they experience it in class. Parents can be included in workshops which can be run in conjunction with teacher workshops, so that students can receive the benefits of high expectations from both groups. The program develops communication skills and encourages constructive goal setting.

For further information, see Resource People Abstract No. 30, Jorge Cardoso, in Part C4, below.

Descriptors: Teacher in-service, university-school collaboration

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 23

MI BENTON HARBOR BENTON HARBOR AREA SCHOOLS

Dr. James Hawkins
Superintendent
Benton Harbor Area Schools
711 E. Britain
Benton Harbor, Michigan 49022 (616) 926-1141

In 1981, a Federal court desegregation order mandated that Benton Harbor Area Schools implement the Achievement and Social Skills Model of school improvement as formulated by Dr. James P. Comer of the Yale University Child Study Center in New Haven, Connecticut. The Benton Harbor desegregation case had been in litigation since 1967, and after consultation with Dr. Comer, the Federal court judge asked him to implement his program, which had seen success in New Haven (the project is described in Comer's book, School Power), in Benton Harbor. A special education teacher from Benton Harbor, Erma Mitchell, was selected to be trained in the process through participation in a year-long fellowship program at the Yale Child Study Center.

The primary aim of Benton Harbor's School Development Project has been to identify and reduce the causes for distrust, alienation and conflict between the home and the school and between staff and students. The implementation of the program involved three major components: the Steering Committee, Tier I and Tier II. The Steering Committee is a representative government and management body at the district level composed of administrators, teachers and parents. The Steering Committee makes policy decisions, sets goals, and monitors and evaluates the program. The Tier I component is designed to improve the leadership and management skills of principals and prepare them for participation in the program. After the Tier I process is completed, the Tier II component provides coordinated support for the project schools and establishes a governance and management committee at the school level. This committee is composed of the

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking, coproduction, parent education	Climate

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

principal and representatives of parent and teacher groups. Consensus planning is utilized to develop and implement the School Instructional Plan. Parents have the major responsibility for developing a calendar of activities to improve the school climate. In addition, a Mental Health Team is established in each school to help parents and staff work with children and each other with less resistance, confrontation, and conflict. This structure aides each of the four project schools in moving toward school effectiveness where all students are expected to and do function at national norm levels in academic achievement areas.

Contact for further information about parent involvement: Erma Mitchell, Coordinator, School Improvement Program, Benton Harbor Area Schools, 240 Jefferson, Benton Harbor, Michigan 49022, (616) 925-2752.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILES NO. 24**

MI FLINT FLINT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dr. James E. Ray
or Dr. Robert Knapp
Flint Community School District
923 East Kearsley
Flint, Michigan 48502 (313) 762-1263

Flint Community School District's school improvement project was piloted in one elementary school and one middle school. The criteria for selection of these schools were:

1. Schools with stable teacher and student populations
2. Schools with improving test scores
3. Schools with a record of community cooperation
4. Schools with large minority populations

Representatives of the school staffs attended training sessions offered by Ron Edmonds and Larry Lezotte and data were collected by interviewing teachers using the Connecticut School Improvement Interview and the Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview. Action teams for each school were organized, and the teams developed detailed action plans for school improvement. Responsibililty for implementation of the action plans lay solely with the action teams, giving them an incentive to monitor progress closely.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking	Climate, community education, expectations, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 25**

MI MARQUETTE MARQUETTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Dr. Susan Black
Assistant Superintendent
Marquette Public Schools
1201 West Fair Avenue
Marquette, Michigan 49855 (906) 228-8800

As a result of a joint effort with the Middle Cities Association of Michigan and the Center for School Improvement at Michigan State University, the Marquette Public Schools and the Marquette-Alger Intermediate School District began a three-year project to define, develop and evaluate effective schools. The project was largely derived from the research of and models for school improvement developed by Ron Edmonds and Larry Lezotte of the Center for School Improvement.

During the 1981-82 school year, a staff team from the school districts participated in an extensive training program designed to acquaint them with the effective schools research and models for school improvement and to provide them with the resources to plan a local improvement project. The models and materials used in this training had been developed under the direction of Edmonds and Lezotte as part of their School Improvement Team Training Project.

This planning aimed to develop a proposal for a local school improvement program and bring it through administrative channels to the school board. This development process followed a three-step plan -- pre-planning, planning and implementation. During the pre-planning stage, team members conducted training sessions, collected data and worked to increase the awareness of school district personnel and community leaders. In the planning stage, the group:

- defined and identified three types of schools in the district -- improving, maintaining and declining

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, co-production, decisionmaking	Expectations, institutional focus, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 26**

MO ST. LOUIS ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mary Ferguson
Coordinator
NW Area Community School
5019 Alcott
St. Louis, Missouri 63120 (314) 261-8282

Project SHAL is named for the first letters in the names of the first four participating schools, all of them in mostly black, high poverty neighborhoods in North St. Louis. The project began in 1981 with a grant from the Danforth Foundation to initiate a school improvement effort based on the five characteristics of effective schools identified by Ron Edmonds and others. The chronology of Project SHAL included:

1. Formation of an Executive Council including the four principals, a project coordinator, the Area Superintendent, and representatives of the Foundation and St. Louis Public Schools' Management Academy.

2. Formation of an Administrative Council consisting of the Executive Council plus 15 teachers, parents from the four schools, and representatives of the area and central schools.

3. Formation of five task forces, one dealing with each of the five effective schools characteristics.

4. Project participants visited similar projects elsewhere (Milwaukee, New York City, and Pontiac, Michigan).

5. The development and administration of a 220-item needs assessment instrument.

6. In a four-week summer institute, participants prepared individual school plans for 1981-82. Out of this

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, co-production, decisionmaking	Climate, expectations, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress, needs assessment

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

> institute grew a wide variety of activities that were implemented at each SHAL school in 1981-82. These included activities involving increased time-on-task, improvement of school climate, student motivation and discipline policies, involvement of parents in students' learning and improvement in basic skills instruction.

Instructional Facilitators provide project support for the four original SHAL schools and the twelve schools added in 1982-83.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 27**

NJ PATERSON PATERSON SCHOOL DISTRICT

Joseph Heitzman
Director of Funded Programs
Paterson School District
Office of Superintendent
33 Church Street
Paterson, New Jersey 07505 (201) 279-0519

The Basic Skills Improvement Program (BSIP) began in 1965 in SCE/Chapter I schools, grades K-12. It provided supplemental instructional service to pupils who had, as a result of a district-wide needs assessment process, demonstrated the greatest need for supplemental instructional services. Measures of progress used were multiple measures, including test score data and analysis.

In the summer of 1983, the Basic Skills Improvement Program served students in grades K-8. The program centers provided meals and enrichment activities. Each center scheduled after-school parent conferences and parents were invited to end-of-program activities held at all of the centers. Parents were also involved in the BSIP through the Board of Education-appointed District Advisory Committee and the local school councils. The District Advisory Committee consists of members representing each school. Parents had four areas of responsibility: to monitor the program; to make recommendations about needs of eligible children; to encourage further parent involvement; to assist in the formation of local school and district programs and to help improve the academic skills of participating students.

For further information about parent involvement, contact: Rosalind D. Ellerbee, Assistant Director of Funded Programs, Paterson School District, 33 Church Street, Paterson, New Jersey 07505, (201) 279-0519.

Participatory Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, advocacy: monitoring, co-production, home-school communication	Institutional focus

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 28**

NY KENMORE TOWN OF TONAWANDA
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Robert Freeland
Supervisor
Staff Development and Special Programs
Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda Public Schools
1500 Colvin Boulevard
Kenmore, New York 14223 (716) 877-6800 x. 362

The school improvement plan was conceived in 1982, districtwide, for 12 schools. This program envisions the formation of school planning teams in each of the 12 schools, who would plan for school improvement projects and create a "vision statement."

A sample vision statement from one school details a school in which children at the end of the fifth grade have mastered basic academic and living skills and have helped teach fellow students. Parents are to be active participants in the educational process by sharing in all phases of planning for the accountability and evaluation of their children. Lifelong learning is encouraged as the community becomes involved in educational programs based in the school. At another school, parents would be invited to the teacher inservice programs, to help plan programs and to contribute their expertise in specified areas.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Co-production, decisionmaking, parent education	Community education, expectations, monitoring pupil progress

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 29**

NY NEW YORK CITY OF NEW YORK - CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Anthony Spina
Project Director
School Improvement Project
City of New York - Central School District
131 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201 (212) 596-6007

Begun in 1979-80 with funding from the State of New York and the Ford and Carnegie Foundations, New York's School Improvement Project (SIP) was originated by that system's central administration and has operated in 25 schools during the years 1979-1983. Shortly before, Chancellor Frank Macchiarola had invited Ron Edmonds to join his staff and to tackle the problem of student achievement and school effectiveness. The primary goal of SIP, like that of the concurrent local School Development Project, was to establish local school planning committees and for these committees to be broadly representative of a school constituency -- administrators, teachers, and parents. The planning committee at each school drew up a plan that addressed the five correlates of effective schools. These characteristics are:

(1) Strong leadership at the school level
(2) High expectations for student performance, conveyed by all staff
(3) An orderly school climate
(4) Strong emphasis on teaching the basic skills
(5) Frequent evaluation and on-going monitoring of pupil progress

Another important aspect of SIP was the role played by school liaisons, persons employed as change agents to respond to schools' requests for assistance and to identify and develop preexisting resources for strengthening the effectiveness factors already at work in the school. Thus, the School Improvement

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, advocacy: monitoring, co-production	Climate, expectations, institutional focus, instructional leadership, needs assessment, program evaluation

Project incorporated aspects of school-based planning, the liaison role and the emphasis on school effectiveness research. Overall, the project proceeded through these phases in each project school:

(1) Program introduction, including selection of schools and accomodation of the liaison into the school community.

(2) A needs assessment conducted by the liaison (4 to 6 weeks).

(3) Development of a school improvement plan based on the five effective school factors (above) (4 to 6 weeks).

(4) Formation of a school planning committee.

(5) Plan review and approval.

(6) Implementation of the plan.

(7) Plan evaluation and revision.

(8) Maintenance, during which implementation, evaluation, and revision processes become regular cycles and the liaison is no longer in the school, although assistance is available on request (at this point, the liaison will have been active in the school for approximately two years).

Project assessment and documentation was carried out by New York City Public Schools' Metropolitan Educational Development and Research Project. Achievement test results seem to indicate SIP was a success. For two of the three years analyzed, SIP schools showed greater increases in students' reading at or above grade level than did schools citywide. Perhaps more important is what the project has learned about the process of school improvement. Some of the key points here include:

(1) The school's reaction to the results of the needs assessment appears to be one of the clearest indications of its readiness to continue with the change process.

(2) Project administrators reported that vital leadership came from the principal. In schools where the improvement plan was working, the principal was the key person.

(3) Preliminary results show that SIP schools with greater student achievement have been more actively committed and more loyal to the SIP process. They have taken their own school improvement plans seriously and have implemented them with success, particularly the basic skills components.

For more information about parent involvement, contact Mrs. Ernestine Santos, 990 Anderson Avenue, Bronx, New York 10452, (212) 538-3922.

NY NEW YORK CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROJECT

EUBANKS, E.E. and D.U. LEVINE (1983). "A First Look At Effective School Projects at Inner City Schools." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City.

The Comprehensive Planning Project (CPP) was initiated by New York City schools' central administration's Comprehensive Planning Unit (CPU) to study the issue of fragmentation between regular subject classes and Chapter I or other externally-funded classes. The CPU worked out models of comprehensive planning for the school district and school levels then proceeded to work with five elementary and junior high schools during the 1980-81 academic year.

CPP schools had planning committees consisting of the principal, assistant principals, and representatives of teachers, parents, the district office and the United Federation of Teachers. Their aim is to reduce fragmentation in the objectives of instruction, the role of staff, pull-out arrangements, staff development, records and communications.

The CPU research had indicated that schools with effective comprehensive planning and programming had uniform objectives for funded programs and basic tax-levy instruction, reduced effects for pull-out programs, heterogeneously grouping all students for reading instruction, individual diagnostic prescriptive information for each student, and a return to basic skills instruction. Plans at each school are addressing the above mentioned aspects of school operation and also other goals designated as priorities at the school level.

For further information, see Resource People Abstract No. 25: Daniel Levine, in Part C4, below.

Topic Descriptors: Curriculum alignment.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 31**

NY NEW YORK CITY DISTRICT 19, BROOKLYN

LEVINE, D.U. and J. STARK (1982). "Instructional Organizational Arrangements That Improve Achievement in Inner City Schools," in Educational Leadership (December).

CMLRP (Chicago Mastery Learning Program) is a system that is focused on the learning of specific essential skills. CMLRP is implemented in schools with building level staff development, where the teachers meet weekly for instructional decisionmaking in a given grade. It is used in both regular and parallel clases (for the lowest achieving students) and improves the appropriativeness of instruction through curriculum alignment.

The strategy in Brooklyn's District 19 used a district-wide list of essential skills for each grade and a series of criterion-referenced tests for assessing mastery of these skills. The resulting data is thus provided for diagnosing and prescribing solutions to various learning problems. As part of CMLRP, parents are asked to notify the administration as to the efficacy of certain homework assignments. They receive booklets describing and explaining CMLRP, and mailings showing the progress of their children's performance on basic skills.

District 19 reported the percentage of student scoring two years or more below grade level and the California Roading Achievement Test decreased by half in three years. The percentage of students at or above grade level increased from 30% to 40%.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Co-production, home-school communication	Expectations, homework, institutional focus, mastery learning, monitoring pupil progress

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 32**

NY NEW YORK CITY LOCAL SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

EUBANKS, E. and D.U. LEVINE (1983). "A First Look at Effective Schools in New York City and Milwaukee," Phi Delta Kappan (June).

Sponsored by the New York Board of Education and the New York Urban Coalition, the Local School Development Project (LSPD) began in 1979-80 and worked in 38 New York schools to improve achievement by establishing a planning team at each school site. Participating schools included elementary, intermediate, junior high, and one alternative school. Funding was extensive -- over $2 million a year -- from Board of Education funds, Urban Coalition funding for the project administration, and grants from the Ford and Carnegie Foundations.

Five school districts in New York City's decentralized framework were invited to participate. Each of these districts was headed by a district superintendent eager to participate in the project. Each district received the services of a comparatively large staff -- a full-time consultant, resource coordinators, project coordinators, a youth coordinator, and a coordinator of research and development, and the three project administrators. The superintendents then asked individual schools to volunteer in participating in the project.

The majority of the schools that eventually volunteered for the project had well below 50% of their students reading below grade level.

At each school task forces of administrators, teachers and parents chose how their planning team was to be reorganized and who was to be a member of the team. The project itself began by conducting extensive workshops in leadership and management skills for principals. These workshops were presented by a private consulting firm. Principals and the planning teams' chairpersons also attended comprehensive sessions that outlined and

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, advocacy, decisionmaking	In-service, instructional leadership

discussed their roles in planning a school improvement project. While each planning team was allowed considerable leeway in planning its school activities the LDSP planning manual specifies that these activities address the "learning environment in terms of basic skills instruction (reading, math, language arts and where appropriate, bilingual education), staff development, parent participation, and school administration." Local school plans addressed a wide variety of different aspects of these problem areas in a wide variety of planned activities.

Standardized test results show that LDSP was effective: the project's formal evaluation showed that where 42% of the project schools had 40% of their students reading at grade level, in 1980 67% of the schools had 40% of their pupils at grade level two years later. Three factors were found to prevail in successful planning efforts. These were: (1) strong leadership from the principal and the planning team chairperson, (2) good working relationship among team members, and (3) commitment of team members to the planning process.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 33**

OH DAYTON I/D/E/A/ "SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM"

Gil Johnson
I/D/E/A
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45426 (513) 434-7300

The "School Improvement Program" is really a network of some 50 schools who are using the concepts, and materials, and consultants prepared and mobilized by I/D/E/A (the Institute for Development of Educational Activities -- see Resource Organization Abstract No. 9, in Part C3, below). The network is united in local applications of a systematic process, developed by I/D/E/A's analysis of the practical implications of the effective schools research and on other research on organizational change and development. The I/D/E/A model works with a firm understanding that becoming effective is a process of organizational change, on a school by school basis.

Schools that participate in the school improvement project involve parents, teachers, administrators, students, and interested community members in a five-stage cycle for school improvement: readiness, planning, training, implementing and maintaining. Principals are trained to facilitate the entire process for their school often with the help of a central office facilitator. The key leadership role, however, is the principal's.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking	Climate, expectations, in-service, institutional focus, instructional leadership, business-school partnerships, school-university collaboration

OR WEST LINN WEST LINN SCHOOL DISTRICT #33

Richard Sagor
Principal
West Linn High School
West A Street
West Linn, Oregon 97068 (503) 655-2330

The West Linn Schools Improvement Project was planned during 1983-84 and is to be initiated in 1984-85, districtwide. The definition of effectiveness to be used will be high levels of academic achievement by all students. The measures of progress used are to be longitudinal studies of student performance and the utilization of standardized tests only upon mastery of the required curriculum.

The school board organized a series of community meetings in the fall of 1983 to invite the community to assess the condition of our schools and to ask their help in designing a comprehensive plan for the improvement of their district. The community members specifically advised the board to increase academic standards, increase requirements in science, math and computer education, and to consider establishing foreign language programs in the early grades, and to maintain high quality staff. As a result of the discussions, the staff was directed to develop a comprehensive plan for school improvement addressing the needs identified by staff, community and national studies.

A key element in these efforts is the formation of strong partnerships with the parents. Parents are being encouraged to provide quality study time at home for their children and help them understand that the academic experience daily extends beyond the six or seven hours that their children spend at school.

The community meetings were well-publicized by a general letter of invitation to all district patrons. Others were recommended by school staff and were mailed a request to attend the meeting. All invitees received a packet of explanatory

Paricipation Descriptors	Topic Indicators
Advocacy, co-production, home-school communication, tutoring: At-home	Community surveys, homework, monitoring pupil progress, testing, time-on-task

materials including a summary of effective schools research, West Linn School District data, and a set of four pre-meeting questions. Maintaining fruitful two-way communication between schools and parents were stressed as being critical to having good schools. When the participants of the meetings were surveyed, nearly half of the respondents rated the process of the meetings as excellent.

SC COLUMBIA RICHLAND COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT ONE

John May
Director of Research
Richland County School District One
1616 Richland Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201 (803) 765-2491

Richland County Schools has done more than just talk about instructional leadership. It has implemented a principal internship program in which staff members who were being trained for principal positions were assigned to upgrade the schools of Richland County. After three years the program saw good results.

In this model, every school is called upon to strive for high quotas on six performance factors (test scores in reading/language arts and math; teacher and student attendance; parent and student satisfaction). To be considered effective, a school must have met predetermined criteria in at least four areas, two of these being test score areas. When a school was able to do this it received a grant of two dollars per student for every goal achieved. The school would also have gotten a flag, to signify "exemplary" status.

The other important element of the Richland program was a two-hour annual meeting that each principal has with the superintendent. Scheduled for the summer, it was meant to be a time to discuss data from the year past, outline future goals and arrange for special programs. The principals were pleased to be able to meet individually with the superintendent and credited the program with bringing about improvements in their buildings.

Topic Descriptors: Expectations, instructional leadership.

SC COLUMBIA

RICHLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT ONE
A.C. MOORE SCHOOL

WINECOFF, S.Z. (1982). "Citizen Participation in Developing an Effective School," in Citizen Action in Education* IX, No. 2, (November).

At the A.C. Moore School in 1981, the Citizen's Advisory Council worked with the principal, a volunteer coordinator, the Title I parent advisory council, parents, faculty, and staff to decide which elements at the school needed improvement. After reviewing the effective schools research, the Citizen's Advisory Council decided on five factors to press for:

a. mutually agreed upon instructional goals
b. improving the school environment
c. teachers who encourage all students to learn
d. emphasis on math and reading skills
e. extracurricular activities to fill students' needs for self-esteem, interaction, and developmental progress

These characteristics were used as the basis for developing a set of detailed needs assessment instruments to be used with parents, faculty, administrators, students and other staff. The results of the surveys, interviews, and observation were analyzed by the council and formed the basis of a clearly defined school improvement plan.

Each objective of the plan was supported by several strategies, projected budget requirements and the projected date of implementation. Most of the strategies required no additional funds. For the objective of providing teacher support to children having emotional or academic difficulty, the strategies ranged from inservice teacher training workshops to using the University of South Carolina resources to develop a guidance center at the school.

---

* Citizen Action in Education is published twice yearly by IRE.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking	Climate, expectations, inservice, needs assessment, school-community collaboration

TX COLLEGE STATION

BERRIDGE, R.I., et al. (n.d.) Focus on the Family: the Texas Model for K-12/Community Education Integration Center for Community Education, Texas A & M University.

Three schools were chosen for the first year (1983) development of the Better Learning Program: Bay City, Silsbee and Waxahachie. An autonomous steering committee was formed for each district comprised of members of the school and community. Each committee analyzed needs, reviewed resources and outlined specific programs. The chairman then made a formal report to the school board, who then appointed a liaison to the committee. The committee moved from needs identification to goal setting, to program development.

Silsbee and Bay City decided to implement the "Better Learner" program as a form of home-school cooperation. In each case, parent-teacher contracts were signed and personalized folders with activities were sent home weekly with the children. Conferences with family members are held twice a year. Attitude surveys, developed by the National Study of School Evaluation, were given to teachers and parents twice a year.

For further information, see Resource People Abstract No. 49: Ann Kraatz-Calahan, in Part C4, below.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, co-production, decisionmaking, home-school communication, tutoring: At-home	Community education, community surveys, in-service, needs assessment, school-university collaboration

TX SILSBEE KIRBY SCHOOL

BERRIDGE, R.I., et al. (n.d.) A Focus on the Family: The Texas Model for K-12/Community Education Integration Center for Community Education, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas

The "Better Learner Program" was launched in 1982 at Kirby School on a volunteer basis. It was concentrated on the second grade level. A participating teacher would notify parents of the program, and those interested would meet with the teacher to review a contract. If it is signed and endorsed by the principal parents are pledged to listen to their children read aloud 15 minutes three times a week, at home. They also pledge to spend time reading on their own interest level as their child reads on his, to supervise weekly activities assigned by the teachers, and to reurn response sheets.

Teachers pledge to give the child individual assistance, to provide activity packets and supplementary books for home use, and to confer regularly with parents.

Parents evaluated the program approvingly after the first year. Achievement test scores showed measurable gains for the children. Interest was expressed in expanding the contractual agreement to include math and sciences through the sixth grade level.

See also Project Profile No. 37, above.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Co-production, tutoring: at-home	Community education, time-on-task

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 39**

UT SALT LAKE CITY SALT LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Robert L. Wakefield
Public Information Officer
Salt Lake City School District
440 East First South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 (801) 328-7352

The system of "Shared Governance," a districtwide project, was instituted in Salt Lake City in 1974. The goals were increased pupil achievement, greater public confidence in schools and positive relationships within the school and community. Under Shared Governance, employee salaries and fringe benefits were improved more than the normal growth rate, and concentration on teaching and learning became a high priority of both the Board of Education and the school district personnel.

In 1974, the Board of Education met with the Salt Lake Teachers Association and drew up a written agreement which provided the basis whereby the Salt Lake City district is governed. Revised each year, it has provisions which establish the structures for the local school councils and their areas of responsibility. These are not laid down in specifics; any areas not specified in the written agreement are left to the decisions of each local council. Shared Governance through local councils helps to strengthen parental attitudes towards the schools and improves the variety and quality of education in the schools by bringing a broader range of input into the decisionmaking process. School regulations no longer can be challenged at the whim of a principal but now are considered the judgement of a group of interested and concerned professionals with common objectives. Shared Governance in Salt Lake City has brought about greater public confidence in the public schools and test scores which have been above the national norm for several years.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, decisionmaking	Expectations, institutional focus

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 40**

VA CHARLOTTESVILLE ALBEMARLE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Sarah Radkowsky
Supervisor of School-Community Relations
Albemarle County Public Schools
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901 (804) 296-5826

Albemarle County Public School's Increasing Teaching Effectiveness program is designed to help teachers and administrators to improve their instructional skills, by focusing on four essential elements of instruction. These are:

- Teaching to an educational objective
- Selecting an objective at the correct level of difficulty
- Monitoring the learner and adjusting instruction based on information gained
- Incorporating established psychological principles of learning into teaching

The training consists of a four week course with five full workshop days with emphasis on specific instructional skills, guided practice and teaching practicums. The project operates in all of the district's 21 schools.

Topic Descriptors: Behavioral objectives, in-service, monitoring pupil progress.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 41**

WA BATTLE GROUND BATTLE GROUND SCHOOL DISTRICT #119

Dr. Tim Carman
Asst. Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction
Battle Ground School District #119
204 West Main Street
Battle Ground, Washington 98604 (206) 687-5171 x. 278

The Battle Ground School District Effective Schools Program began in 1980 in eleven schools grades K-12. The goals formulated for more effective schools were: strong administrative leadership, high percentage of time spent in academic learning, monitoring of student academic progress, use of alternative teaching strategies when needed, and more parent and community contact.

In 1981, the Battle Ground School District formed building-based improvement teams in each of the eleven schools. There was a Steering Committee at each building composed of a principal, a teacher, and a parent. They each developed a planning team composed of teachers, administrator, parents, students, and community members. Each member then was to reach out to five peers to form a broadened base of communication.

The general goals of each Steering Committee were:

(a) Each building level committee would develop a viable five-year plan.

(b) Establish shared decisionmaking processes at each school site.

(c) Develop procedures to allow students, parents, educators and school patrons to be partners in school improvement.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, co-production, decisionmaking	Community surveys, instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress, time-on-task

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

Each committee articulated a model for school improvement to insure a planned, systematic K-12 program and to provide community members with information.

The goals for 1983-84 were to develop programs and practices to increase academic learning time, design and implement a "Parent Action PAC" , implement an improved Volunteer Program, develop a peer tutoring program, develop and plan for minimum competency testing at each grade level, and develop a "Partners in Education" program.

Since 1981, attendance at the schools has improved, G.P.A.'s over 3.00 were achieved by 100 additional students, and CAT test scores rose. The dropout rate fell, the incidence of vandalism sank to zero. The program has been evaluated by ongoing assessment in the form of community surveys.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 42**

WA SEATTLE SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Susan Austin, Coordinator
Project ACCESS/Citizen Involvement
Citizens' Education Center Northwest
105 S. Main Street
Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 624-9955

In October, 1981, the Citizens Education Center Northwest, a state-wide, non-profit group interested in encouraging citizen leadership in public education, and the Seattle School District, with a grant from the Ford Foundation, launched Project ACCESS. The acronym ACCESS stands for A Community Cooperating for Effective Seattle Schools. During the 1981-82 school year, the project staff and citizens involved in the project planned ways to improve academic achievement, climate and communication in their schools. During the next two years of the planned project (1982-84), citizens and staff will work to implement and refine these plans.

During this first year, Project ACCESS sought to:

- Expand community understanding of the importance of citizen involvement in the schools
- Help citizens become informed participants in the school-site decisionmaking process
- Identify untapped community resources
- Document what parents, community and staff were saying about citizen involvement in Seattle's schools

Project ACCESS' first year studied 21 Seattle schools chosen for their diversity and representativeness. In addition, ACCESS support activities included:

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advocacy, co-production, decisionmaking, parent education	Climate, community surveys, instructional leadership

- A principals' inservice program that provided training for 50 building administrators. Aimed at increasing their management capabilities and improving their effectiveness as instructional leaders, this program was conducted in cooperation with Seattle University

- Building-level meetings convened to involve staff and citizens in developing, monitoring and revising school improvement plans

- Network meetings for teachers to exchange opinions and information that will lead to professional growth and school improvement

- Districtwide forums on topics related to academics, school climate, communication and decisionmaking

- The building of models for effective citizen involvement by gathering information from community interviews and small workshops and by examining methods already working elsewhere

Years II and III of ACCESS were designed to (1) demonstrate innovative strategies for involving more citizens in school improvement efforts, and (2) foster districtwide support, awareness and preparedness among citizens and staff involved in school improvement planning.

The profiles developed in Year I were used not only as "baseline" data to measure the project's effectiveness, but as a planning tool to highlight ways in which parents could become involved and identify barriers to their involvement.

It is hoped that Project ACCESS' study of school-bsaed planning and citizen involvement will make for a more successful planning process, leading in turn to improved achievement and school improvement. Much of the success of school-based planning depends on the availability of key information in order to make appropriate school improvement decisions. To this end, many of Project ACCESS' activities have focused on ways of getting information to citizens and enabling them to get the information themselves. During 1983-84, Project ACCESS will conduct districtwide workshops to address the issues raised in their surveys. These workshops will focus on topics ranging from understanding school budgets to sharing strategies for expanding parent involvement.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 43**

WA SELAH SELAH SCHOOL DISTRICT #119

Stanley J. Zehm
Assistant Superintendent
Selah School District #119
105 West Bartlett
Selah, Washington 98942 (509) 697-7243

The Selah Family-Centered Math Project was proposed in 1978 and implemented in 1979. It is a home-school partnership in which teachers and parents work together to help children in grades 1-5 learn mathematics through the use of learning activities at home. Source books are supplied for both teachers and the parents to explain program goals and give directions for math games and activities to create learning time at home. Each activity focuses on a particular skill. Parents and teachers meet regularly to discuss the child's progress. Learning objectives are developed by both parents and teachers.

In January 1983 the Family-Centered Reading Project began, inspired by the success of the math project. The program is aimed at children in grades 1-5, especially those who are not performing at their potential level of ability. A series of home-based activities and games have been devised for use during 15 to 20 minutes every other night. As one assistant superintendent said, "We are operating on the premise that the parent is the child's first and most important teacher." Reading aloud to children is being promoted as an important way to expose them to literature at an early age and to increase learning comprehension and vocabulary. Teachers involved in the project will participate in an ongoing training process in the areas of parent involvement, use of the project's games, and effective reading instruction.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, co-production, decisionmaking, tutoring: at-home	In-service

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS — PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 44

WA SNOHOMISH SNOHOMISH SCHOOL DISTRICT #201

Dr. Ronald G. Crawford
Superintendent
Snohomish School District #201
1506 Fifth Street
Snohomish, Washington 98290 (206) 568-3151

The Snohomish Plan for Excellence (Pupil Expectations, Learning Research and Application Assessment of Students, Needs of Students, Staff and Community) is a planning model that was conceived in 1983-84 for nine district schools, to begin September 1984, grades K-12. Effectiveness as defined by the Board of Directors includes seven factors:

(a) Strong leadership by the principal, who would teach students once a month and observe instruction daily.

(b) High expectations of students and staff. Each teacher would state in writing expectations for the students and would share this information with parents and students.

(c) Orderly learning environment. Facilities maintained well.

(d) Basic skills highest priority. Principals responsible for eliminating non-productive activity in classrooms.

(e) Coordinated use of services and resources. Principals would assist staff in use and selection of resources and begin the development of a "teacher resource center" in each school. School staff would maintain a community resource file.

(f) Informal support by parents and community. All parents are encouraged to visit schools each year.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Co-production, home-school communication	Climate, expectations, institutional focus, instructional leadership

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

WASHINGTON, D.C. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Dr. James T. Guines
Associate Superintendent of Instruction
District of Columbia Public Schools
415 12th Street, N.W., Room 903
Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 724-4173

The District of Columbia Public Schools developed a competency-based curriculum (CBC) which went into use in the school year of 1976-79. The CBC approach is a systematic procedure for identifying, developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising instructional strategies. Four broad skills areas are the overall focus of the curriculum: communication skills, analytical skills, social skills, and self-actualization skills. The effectiveness of the program was defined as an improvement in standardized test scores; for example, test scores and an increase in pupil retention. The measures of progress used were the CAT test, PSAT, SAT and retention rates.

At Jefferson Junior High School, the plan called for review of the major areas of student weakness on standardized tests. Principals and teachers were reminded, in this superintendent-mandated program, that students needed more work in comprehension, analysis and thinking. It was suggested that students were being held back because administrators weren't expecting enough of students or themselves. Under the program, teachers were directed to provide more structured learning environments with more direction and to share with the students their own value systems and emphasis on academic goals. Principals took part in workshops on how to increase learning time.

Parents supported the Jefferson program by providing a learning environment and certain educational activities at home and by signing a written Parent Agreement. They were asked to

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory council, co-production, decisionmaking, tutoring: at-home	Curriculum alignment, institutional focus, expectations, lesson plans, monitoring of pupil progress

support the program and encourage their child to study and then return the signed agreement to the school.

Program results appear to be positive as student scores on standardized test scores have improved for two years.

For further information about parent involvement, contact: Rod Boggs, Parents United for Full School Funding, 733 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., (202) 783-8585.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 46**

WI MILWAUKEE PROJECT RISE

Robert Baer
Administrative Specialist
Milwaukee Public Schools
Post Office Drawer 10K
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201 (414) 475-8018

In March 1979, Milwaukee's school board directed its school administration to form a plan for improving student achievement in the 20 schools (18 elementary, and two middle schools) scoring lowest on annual achievement tests. Thus, Project RISE (Rising to Individual Scholastic Excellence) was conceived to serve low-achieving and predominantly low-income and minority students.

Project RISE was grounded in several basic assumptions:

(1) Virtually all students, regardless of background, race, or SES, can acquire the basic skills.

(2) Inappropriate expectations, practices, and policies on the part of the school account for the disproportionate low achievement of low-income and minority students.

(3) The literature as effective schools has identified practices that can be cultivated to produce effective schools.

Each of RISE's 20 schools developed an individual school plan but in forming these plans, project staff and RISE principals and teachers were instructed to include these "essential elements": (i) school climate; (ii) curriculum; (iii) instruction; (iv) coordination of supportive services; (v) evaluation; and (vi) parent and community support.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, co-production	Attendance, climate, expectations, instructional leadership, time-on-task

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

Although it was coordinated at the district level, RISE principals were extensively involved in the project. The project principals met regularly, and some formed working groups to address specific problems. As in other school improvement projects, there was a strong emphasis on in-service training for both principals and teachers.

Although one of the basic assumptions of RISE is that the school is primarily responsible for a student's learning, the project considered parent and community involvement to be essential. Parents and community are seen as a source of support for the school and to this end, schools must communicate what they are doing to parents. Parents can also help by ensuring their children's regular attendance, maintaining their own positive attitudes about school and schooling, and by providing direct, specific assistance to children. Community agencies can enable nearly all parents to help their children.

Achievement test scores from 1981 seem to indicate that Project RISE has been a success. RISE schools have shown dramatic improvement in mathematics scores form 1979 to 1981, and less clear-cut improvement in reading. In 1982-83, the school improvement process was extended to all of Milwaukee's schools although RISE continues as a separate program.

B: PRACTICES AND PROJECTS **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 47**

WI WAUWATOSA WAUWATOSA SCHOOL DISTRICT

Maxine Newsome
Director of Elementary Education
Wauwatosa School District
12121 West North Avenue
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin 53226 (414) 259-4488

In a program they called "Design for Excellence," the Wauwatosa School District completed their program improvement plan in January 1984 for grades K-12. The long-range program considers the entire Wauwatosa instructional program in the broad sense, emphasizing a comprehensive course of study with rigorous standards for all students.

Primary responsibility for the development and implementation of the project is given to the District Improvement Committee, composed of teachers, principals, and three directors. Teaching staff are assigned to the several program subcommittees.

The main goals are to: (a) provide a systematic review of basic curricular activities; (b) provide a sequence of skills within program areas which follow an orderly progression from grades K-12; and (c) set grade level expectations for student learning.

This project is based on citizen response to a district-wide survey. It will provide a method for evaluating programs using a systematic, continuous plan based upon current research in the field and create a learning program on a district rather than a school-by-school basis.

Topic Descriptors: Expectations, institutional focus, curriculum alignment.

LITERATURE DESCRIBING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PRACTICES

Lately, the movement for instructionally effective schools has been receiving more documentation, not just in hard to get local project reports and evaluations, but in the more accessible published and periodical literature.

The chart on the next page lists the more accessible published overviews and/or case descriptions of school effectiveness projects. In addition, there are several newsletters which either routinely or occasionally contain project descriptions. These are:

THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS REPORT. Grand Central Station, P. O. Box 2038, New York, New York 10163.

PROFILES: PROGRAMS AND PRODUCTS. Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 300 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204.

PARTNERSHIP. Published by the University of California at Los Angeles, Laboratory in School and Community Education, Graduate School of Education, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024.

YOU AND THE SCHOOLS, from the Information Project on Education: Network, 810 Miranda Green, Palo Alto, California 94306. (415)948-7425.

CITIZEN ACTION IN EDUCATION, from the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215. (617)353-3309.

Also, several prominant journals have recently published theme issues on the topic of school effectiveness. These include:

- Theory Into Practice (the Autumn 1981 issue is devoted to the topic of principals as instructional leaders).
- June 1983 issue of Phi Delta Kappan.
- December 1982 issue of Educational Leadership.

READING LIST NO. 4 (continued)

REFERENCE	SCOPE: PLACES AND PROJECTS
BOSSONE, R.M. (1982). What Works in Urban Schools. Proceedings of the University/Urban Schools National Task Force. ED 216 052.	Baltimore, Chicago, Oakland, San Francisco
EDMONDS, R.R. (1982). "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview," in Educational Leadership (December).	An overview of about 15-20 improvement projects nationwide
EUBANKS, E.E. and D.U. LEVINE (1983). "A First Look At Effective Schools Projects," in Phi Delta Kappan (June)	Milwaukee (Project RISE); New York City (School Improvement Project)
GLENN, B.C. (1981). What Works? An Examination of Effective Schools for Poor Black Children. Cambridge: Harvard Center for Law and Education. ED 216 060.	Baltimore, New York City, Richmond (VA)
LEVINE, D.U. and J. STARK (1982). "Instructional and Organizational Arrangements That Improve Achievement in Inner-City Schools," in Educational Leadership (December).	Brooklyn, Chicago, Los Angeles
McCORMACK-LARKIN, M. and W.J. KRITEK (1982). "Milwaukee's Project RISE," in Educational Leadership (December).	Milwaukee
MILES, M., E. FARRAR and B. NEUFELD (1983). Vol. II. The Extent of Adoption of Effective Schools Programs. Huron Institute, Cambridge, MA (January). Prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Education.	Contains survey data on 39 programs in 25 states, including 875 school districts and 2,378 schools.
MURPHY, J.F., et al. (1982). "Academic Press: Translating High Expectations into School Policies and Classroom Practices", in Educational Leadership (December).	San Jose

PART C1: RESOURCES: READINGS

INTRODUCTION

As we noted in the general "Introduction and User's Guide," this Notebook catalogs three kinds of resources -- materials and how-to guides, organizations, and people.

"People" are listed in Part C4, below.

Organizations are listed in Parts C3 and C2, below.

This section lists how-to guides: Those specifically directed to parents are in Reading List No. 5 -- and those directed at school practitioners are in Reading List No. 6.

In each case, we present a selective list. The materials cited have all been either nominated by participants in local school improvement projects or by individuals and organizations queried in our survey of resource people and organizations.

In short, all of the materials listed below came to us with consumer recommendations.

A CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

This is not the only section in which we provide topic-specific bibliographies. Other listings include:

- READING LIST NO.'s 1 and 2 at the end of Part A1, which cite the major original and secondary sources on school effectiveness.
- READING LIST NO. 3, at the end of Part A2, which lists the major research on citizen participation and school effectiveness.
- READING LIST NO. 4, at the end of Part B, which cites the main sources which describe school effectiveness projects and programs.
- READING LIST NO. 7 in Appendix A, which lists parent's guides on testing and understanding pupil achievement data.

GUIDES FOR PARENTS

The focus here is not on parent involvement, generally, but rather on materials which speak directly and concretely on parent involvement in school effectiveness efforts.

The most systematic parents' manual that is most explicitly based on the values and research of the effective schools program is:

GLENN, B. (1981). Effective Schools for Poor Children: A Parent Handbook. Available from Publications, The Center for Law and Education, Gutman Library, 6 Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138.

The National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) also has been most active in making parents and lay citizens more aware of and more effective in participation for school effectiveness. (NCCE is at 410 Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Maryland 21044). Its relevant publications include:

Parent Participation and Student Achievement: The Evidence Grows (1981), by Ann Henderson, is an annotated bibliography providing a good introduction and overview to the issues and the evidence.

Effective Schools: How To Evaluate Them; How To Get Them (1980). Distills the advice and experience of a panel of researchers, school practitioners and parent leaders.

Parents Organizing to Improve Schools (1976).

Your School: How Well Is It Working; A Citizens' Guide to School Evaluation (1982). Designed to help citizens use evaluation methods to measure the quality of local schools.

The School Advisory Council Assistance Project, at Box 51, College of Education, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208 (803)777-7658, has produced a set of 10 guides for school advisory councils. One of them, Understanding and Assessing School Programs, by Mary L. Beach, is in particular relevant to the topic of school effectiveness.

The Best of ERIC, No. 35 (March 1978) provides annotations to 15 works which focus on the topic of "Parent Evaluation of Schools." Best of ERIC bibliographies are available free from:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403.

Also, "Appendix A" to this Notebook contains a procedure for interpreting test result data to see if a school is effective. That discussion is followed by a list of parent guides to testing; see Reading List No. 7.

Two other useful parent-citizen oriented publications are:

How Effective Are Your Schools: A Checklist For Citizens, by the
Council for Basic Education, 725 Fifteenth Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20005.

Resource Materials for School Improvement Initiatives (1983).
Southeastern Public Education Program, Suite 501, Main
Street, Columbia, SC 29201.

GUIDES FOR SCHOOL PRACTITIONERS

Although directed at professionals, many of the guides listed below also provide consumers of schooling services with a good introduction to what professionals see as the best technologies for implementing the recommendations of what the effective schools research say should work.

Please note: As mentioned in the "Foreword," and in the "Introduction," we include only those references which have been nominated and/or forwarded by "practitioners of school-effectiveness," i.e., those school district projects, organizations, and resource people who have responded to our surveys and who are listed in Parts B, C3 and C4, respectively.

Two general,multi-focus guides are:

(1) Effective Instructional Management (1983), by the American Association of School Administrators, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

(2) Rising to Scholastic Excellence: A Guide to School Effectiveness (1982), Milwaukee Public Schools, P. O. Drawer 10K, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201, (414) 475-8018.

Also:

(3) "A School Improvement Planning Process," n.d., by Larry Lezotte, Mimeographed, 6 pages.*

(4) Research Summaries and A Directory of Programs, Services and Resources (1982), by Larry Lezotte and others. Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

Guides which focus more narrowly on procedures and aspects of school effectiveness specifics include:

On Instructional Leadership:

(5) BLUMBERG, A. and W. GREENFIELD (1980), The Effective

---

*Available from the Institute for Responsive Education Clearinghouse on Citizen Participation in School Improvement.

Principal, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

(6) *Effective Principal, Effective School*, by James A. Lipham. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091.

On Effective Classroom Management and Instruction

(7) BERLINER, D.C. (1980). "Using Research on Teaching for the Improvement of Classroom Practice," in *Theory Into Practice* 19, No. 4 (Autumn).

(8) *Classroom Management in the Elementary Grades*, from the Institute for Research in Teaching, Michigan State, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

(9) *Report No. 288: The Effects of Individual Learning Expectations on Student Achievement*, from the Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Baltimore, Maryland 21218.

(10) *Effective Instruction* (1981), from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 225 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

On School Climate

(11) *Improving School Climate* (1980), from the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091.

(12) *Climate: Raising Achievement with Curriculum Keyed to Learning Expectations (CRACKLE)*, from the Center for Urban Affairs, Michigan State, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

Time On Task

(13) *Time on Task* (1982), from the American Association of School Administrators, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

On Assessing Schools

(14) *The Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview Instrument* (1982). Connecticut State Department of Education, Box 2219, Hartford, Connecticut 06115.

(15) *Middle Grades Assessment Program Users' and Leaders' Manual*. Center for Early Adolescence, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Suite 223, Carr Mill Mall, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510.

PART C2: RESOURCES: COMMUNITY EDUCATION

As advocates of parent and community involvement, we are encouraged by the degree of interest in mobilizing the community as a resource for school improvement. As advocates, we are also aware that for a long time now, the community education movement has been preaching and practising the same message.

Chart B, immediately below, contains a census of 30 community education development and assistance centers in 22 states. These centers have reported providing either training, technical assistance, and/or information and publications on community involvement in improving school programs and instructional effectiveness. These 30 centers were identified as a result of responses to a mail survey conducted in November of 1983 to sixty such centers based on a mailing list provided by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Chart B summarizes the responses to the survey. It lists an address and contact person, current through November of 1983, for each center and then profiles what kinds of resources are available. The census is intended to acquaint the uses of the Notebook with the resources and experience to be found in the community education network.

By way of an overview, of the 30 centers responding to the survey 16 are based at colleges and universities, five are at state education agencies, and the remaining nine are in local education agencies, or in county offices of community education. Twenty-four report providing services directly to parent and citizen advisory councils, and twenty have provided assistance to other kinds of parent and civic organizations.

Chart B, by itself, however, does not tell the whole story of how community education has intersected with school improvement efforts. Here are some cross-references to other materials in the Notebook.

Research Brief No. 12, in Part A4, summarizes research investigating the impact of community education on school effectiveness.

Of the 47 school improvement effectiveness projects profiled in Part B, eight have an explicit community education component. See Practices Profile No.'s 1-2, 8, 24, 28, 37, and 38,

Finally, community education has contributed to the "living" resources available for school improvement. Of the 55 resource people listed in Part C4, seven -- Resource People Abstract No.'s 1, 6, 11, 20, 28, 43, and 53 -- are practising community educators.

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
1	ALABAMA Attn: Richard L. Ritchey 111 Coliseum Boulevard Montgomery, AL 36193 (205) 832-6860	Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		Improving Instruction	X	X	X	
2	ARIZONA Arizona Department of Education Attn.: L. B. Cale 1535 W. Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85007 (602) 255-5825	Project Planning	X	X	X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Students Community Organizations
		Needs Assessment	X	X	X	
		Group Process	X	X	X	
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X	X	
		Project Evaluation	X	X	X	
		School-Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		School Program Assessment	For local Voc. Ed. Programs			
		Measuring Pupil Achievement				
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
3	CALIFORNIA Center for Community Education and Citizen Participation Attn.: Louis R. Skiera 522 W. Salsipuedes Street Santa Barbara, CA 93103	Project Planning	X	X	X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Community Organizations State Deputy of Education Staff
		Needs Assessment	X	X	X	
		Group Process	X	X		
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X	X	
		Project Evaluation	X	X		
		School-Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Research Design	X	X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
		School Curriculum Areas	X	X		
		School Climate	X	X		

263

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
4	CALIFORNIA San Diego County Office of Education Attn.: Bruce Braciszewski 6401 Linda Vista Road San Diego, California 92111 (619) 292-3685	Needs Assessment	X		X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents
		Group Process	X		X	
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing			X	
		School/Community Relations	X		X	
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X		X	
		Use of Community Resources	X		X	
		Community Surveys	X		X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X		X	
		School Program Assessment	X		X	
		School Curriculum Areas			X	
5	DELAWARE Center for Educational Leadership and Evaluation College of Education University of Delaware Newark, DE (302) 453-1274	Project Planning		X		Teachers Administrators Community Organizations State Dept. of Education Staff
		Needs Assessment		X		
		Project Evaluation		X		
		School/Community Relations		X	X	
		Use of Community Resources (continued)			X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
5	DELAWARE (continued)	Community Surveys	X	X		
		Research Design	X	X		
		School Program Assessment	X	X		
		Improving Instruction	X	X	X	
		School Climate			X	
		Administrative Practices		X		
		Measuring Pupil Achievement	X	X	X	
6	FLORIDA Center for Community Education University of Florida Attn: Dr. Philip A. Clark 124 Worman Hall Gainesville, FL 32611 (904) 392-0623	Project Planning	X	X		Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Community Organizations State Dept. of Education Staff
		Needs Assessment	X	X		
		Group Process	X	X		
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X		
		Project Evaluation	X	X		
		School/Community Relations	X	X		
		Parent Involvement in Instruction		X		
		Use of Community Resources	X	X		
		Community Surveys (continued)	X	X		

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
6	FLORIDA (continued)	Research Design		X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
		School Program Assessment		X		
		School Curriculum Areas		X		
		School Climate		X		
		Administrative Practices	X	X		
		Citizen Participation	X	X		
7	HAWAII Attn: Dr. Tom Thomas College of Education C & I 1776 University Avenue Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 (808) 948-7740	Project Planning		X	X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Students Community Organizations State Dept. of Education staff
		Needs Assessment	X	X		
		Project Evaluation	X			
		School/Community Relations	X			
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X			
		Use of Community Resources		X		
		Research Design		X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
		(continued)				

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
7	HAWAII (continued)	School Program Assessment		X		
		School Curriculum Areas	X			
		Improving Instruction	X			
		School Climate	X	X	X	
		Citizen Education for Prison Inmates				
		Juvenile Delinquency Prevention				
		Juvenile Diversian Program (Practical Law/ Citizen Education)				
8	HAWAII Hawaii Center for Adult and Community Education Attn.: Ralph Stueber College of Education, UHM 1776 University Avenue Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 (808) 948 7901 (continued)	Project Planning	X	X	X	Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Community Organizations
		Needs Assessment	X	X	X	
		Group Process	X	X		
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing		X		
		School/Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
8	HAWAII (continued)	Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
9	INDIANA Dept. of Public Instruction Attn.: David L. Wilkenson 229 State House Indianapolis, IN 46204 (317) 927-0344	Project Planning	X	X		Teachers Administrators Council Members Parents Community Organizations State Dept. of Education Staff
		Needs Assessment	X	X		
		Group Process		X		
		Project Evaluation	X	X	X	
		School/Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources		X		
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
10	INDIANA Institute for Community Education Development Attn.: Dr. Ethan Janove Dr. Geroge Wood School of Continuing Ed. Ball State University Muncie, Indiana 47306 (317) 285-5033	Co-Production	X	X	X	Parents Administrators Students Community Organizations
		Volunteering in Schools	X	X	X	
		Citizen Use of School Facilities	X	X		
		Partnership Between Schools and Business Community	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
11	MAINE Main Council for Community Education Attn.: David Fearon Merrill Hall, U. of Maine U. of Maine at Farmington Farmington, ME 04938	Project Planning		X	X	"Some of each in Maine Council Network"
		Needs Assessment	X		X	
		Group Process		X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		Administrative Practices	X	X	X	
12	MARYLAND Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Instruction Attn.: Judith Koloski 1200 W. Baltimore Baltimore, MD 21201 (301) 659-2178	Project Planning			X	Administrators Advisory Council Members
		Needs Assessment			X	
		Group Process	X			
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X		
		School/Community Relations		X		
		Parent Involvement in Instruction		X		
		Use of Community Resources		X		
		Community Surveys		X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
		Equal Opportunity Practices		X		

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
13	MARYLAND Dept. of Community Resource Development University of Maryland Attn.: Bruce W. Sorter Symons Hall, 3102 College Park, MD 20742 (301) 454-4249	Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	Parents Students Administrators Community Organizations
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
14	MICHIGAN Flint Community Schools Attn.: Dan Cady 923 E. Kearsley Street Flint, MI 48502	Project Planning	X	X		Teachers Administrators
		Group Process	X	X		
		School-Community Relations	X	X		
		School Program Assessment	X	X		
		Improving Instruction	X	X		
		School Climate	X	X		
		Administrative Practices	X	X		
15	MICHIGAN Eastern Michigan University Attn.: Peter L. Clancy 34 F Boone Ypsilanti, MI 48197 (313) 487-1088 (continued)	Parent Involvement in Instruction			X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members
		School Curriculum Areas	X	X	X	
		Improving Instruction	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
15	MICHIGAN (continued)	Administrative Practices	X	X	X	Parents
		Measuring Pupil Achievement	X	X	X	
16	MISSISSIPPI Center for Community Education Attn.: Dr. William M. Hetrick S.S. Box 9336 U. of Southern Mississippi Hattiesburg, MS 39406 (601) 266-4578	Needs Assessment	X	X		Teachers Administrators State Dept. of Education Staff
		Group Process	X	X		
		School/Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
		School Program Assessment	X	X	X	
		School Curriculum Areas	X	X	X	
		Improving Instruction	X	X		
		School Climate	X	X		

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
17	MONTANA Office of Public Instruction Attn.: Kathleen Mollohan State Capitol Helena, Montana 59620 (406) 444-4423	Project Planning			X	Teachers
		Needs Assessment			X	Administrators
		School/Community Relations			X	Advisory Council Members
		Parent Involvement in Instruction			X	Parents
		Use of Community Resources			X	Community Organizations
		Community Surveys			X	
		Advisory Council Functioning		X		
		School Curriculum Areas		X	X	
18	NEW JERSEY New Jersey Community Education Center Attn.: John E. Radig R. D. 4 Box 209 207 Nelsea Drive Sewell, New Jersey 08080 (609) 228-6000	Project Planning		X	X	Administrators
		Needs Assessment			X	Advisory Council Members
		Fundraising/Proposal Writing	X	X		
		School/Community Relations			X	
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		(continued)				

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
18	NEW JERSEY (continued)	Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		School Climate			X	
		Administrative Practices			X	
19	NORTH CAROLINA Center for Community Education Attn.: Dr. Paul G. Kussrow 346 Duncan Hall -- A.S.U. Boon, North Carolina 28607 (704) 262-2215/2214	Needs Assessment	X			Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Community Organizations
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X	X	
		Project Evaluation		X		
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		School Curriculum Areas	X	X	X	
		Improving Instruction	X	X	X	
		Administrative Practices	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
20	OKLAHOMA Oklahoma State University Community Education Center Attn.: H. F. Donelly 303 Gundersen Center Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078 (405) 624-7246 (405) 377-0556	Project Planning	X	X	X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Students Community Organizations State Dept. of Ed. Staff
		Group Process	X	X	X	
		Project Evaluation	X	X	X	
		School/Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Improving Instruction	X	X	X	
		School Climate	X	X	X	
21	SOUTH CAROLINA Center for Community Education Attn.: Larry Winecoff College of Education U. of South Carolina Columbia, SC 29208 (803) 777-7748	Project Planning	X	X	X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Students Community Organizations
		Needs Assessment	X	X		
		Group Process	X	X		
		Fundraising/Proposal Writing	X	X	X	
		Project Evaluation	X	X		
		School/Community Relations	X	X		
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X		
	(continued)	Use of Community Resources	X	X		

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
21	SOUTH CAROLINA (continued)	Community Surveys	X	X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		School Program Assessment	X	X	X	
		School Curriculum Areas	X	X	X	
		Improving Instruction	X	X	X	
		School Climate	X	X	X	
		Administrative Practices	X	X	X	
		Measuring Pupil Achievement	X	X	X	
22	SOUTH DAKOTA Community Education Development Center Attn.: Dr. Helen Morten School of Education University of South Dakota Vermillion, SD 57069 (605) 677-5368	Project Planning	X	X	X	Administrators
		Needs Assessment	X	X	X	
		Group Process	X	X	X	Advisory Council Members
		Project Evaluation		X	X	
		School/Community Relations		X	X	Community Organizations
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
23	**TENNESSEE** Tennessee State University Attn.: Dr. Edward Hartel 10th and Charlotte Avenue Nashville, TN 37203 (615) 251-1540	Project Planning		X		Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Community Organizations
		Needs Assessment	X	X		
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X	X	
		Project Evaluation		X		
		School/Community Relations		X		
		Parent Involvement in Instruction		X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Community Surveys	X	X		
		Research Design		X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		School Program Assessment			X	
		School Curriculum Areas		X		
		Improving Instruction		X		
		Administrative Practices		X		

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
24	TEXAS Texas Education Agency Attn.: Bill Pounds Community Ed. Spec. 201 E. 11th Street Austin, TX 78701 (512) 834-4266	Project Planning	X	X	X	Advisory Council Members Community Educators
		Needs Assessment	X	X	X	
		Group Process	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X		
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		Administrative Practices	X	X	X	
25	TEXAS College of Education Attn.: Dr. Robert Berridge Center for Community Ed Texas A & M University College Station, TX 77843 (409) 845-2620	Project Planning	X	X	X	Administrator Advisory Council Members Community Organizations State Dept. of Ed. Staff
		Needs Assessment	X	X	X	
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing		X	X	
		Project Evaluation	X	X	X	
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		Public Relations	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
26	TEXAS Silsbee Public Schools Attn.: James B. Lang 415 West Avenue North Silsbee, TX 77646 (409) 385-5288	Project Planning	X	X	X	Teachers Administrators Parents Students Community Organizations State Dept. of Ed. Staff
		Needs Assessment	X	X	X	
		Group Process	X	X	X	
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X	X	
		School/Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Parent Involvement in Instruction	X	X	X	
		Use of Community Resources	X	X	X	
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	
		Research Design	X	X	X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		School Program Assessment	X	X	X	
		School Curriculum Areas	X	X	X	
		Improving Instruction	X	X	X	
		School Climate	X	X	X	
		Administrative Practices	X	X	X	
		Measuring Pupil Achievement	X	X	X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
27	UTAH Community Education Services Attn.: Dr. Denise P. Lindberg Utah State Office of Education 250 East 500 South Salt Lake City, UT 84111 (801) 533-5330	Project Planning		X		Adminis-trators
		Needs Assessment	X	X		
		Group Process	X	X		Advisory Council Members
		Parent Involvement in Instruction		X	X	
		Community Surveys	X	X	X	Community Organi-zations
		Research Design		X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	Local Boards of Educa-tion
		School Program Assessment		X		
		School Curriculum Areas		X		
		Improving Instruction		X		
		School Climate		X		
		Review of Effective Schools Literature		X	X	
		Project Evaluation		X		

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
28	VIRGINIA Virginia Tech Attn.: Steve R. Parson 267 University City Office Building Blacksburg, VA 24061 (703) 961-6136	Project Planning	X	X		Advisory Council Members Community Organizations
		Needs Assessment		X		
		Group Process	X	X		
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing		X		
		Project Evaluation		X		
		School/Community Relations	X	X		
		Use of Community Resources	X	X		
		Community Surveys	X	X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
29	VIRGINIA University of Virginia Attn.: Larry Decker 405 Emmet Street 217 Ruffner Charlottesville, VA 22903 (804) 924-0866	Project Planning	X		X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members
		Needs Assessment		X		
		Group Process	X			
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X	X	X	
		School/Community Relations	X	X	X	
		Parent Involvement in Instruction			X	
		Use of Community Resources			X	

ITEM NO.	STATE/CENTER OR PROGRAM NAME	FOCUS OF SERVICES	TYPE OF SERVICE			SERVICES PROVIDED TO:
			TRAINING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	INFORMATION & PUBLICATIONS	
29	VIRGINIA (continued)	Community Surveys			X	
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X	X	
		School Climate	X	X	X	
30	WASHINGTON Washington Center for Community Education Attn.: Jerry B. Thornton 7510 Armstrong St., SW FG-11 Tumwater, WA 98504 (206) 753-6748	Needs Assessment	X	X	X	Teachers Administrators Advisory Council Members Parents Students
		Group Process	X	X		
		Fundraising/ Proposal Writing	X			
		Project Evaluation	X	X		
		School/Community Relations	X	X		
		Use of Community Resources	X	X		
		Community Surveys	X	X		
		Advisory Council Functioning	X	X		
		Project Planning		X		
		Parent Involvement in Instruction		X	X	

PART C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS

What follows is a listing of 13 organizations which responded to our survey, in the winter and spring of 1984, of more than 20 non-profit consulting and research and development centers which our previous information gathering had identified as being a potential resource.

Such an identification came from two sources. First, we asked respondents to our survey of local school improvement projects to identify directly which groups or agencies were helpful to them. Second, we also asked local projects and programs to identify what materials they found useful in designing and implementing their local improvement projects. Institutional sources of those materials were then added to the mail survey, which resulted in the current listing of organizational resources.

Please note: This section lists those organizations which offered information and materials as organizations. Many respondents to our query also offered one of their members or staff as a resource person, willing to provide more individualized, often on-site technical assistance. In that case, we list the resource person in Part C4.

Readers can get a more comprehensive idea of available resource organizations by combining the abstracts of the 13 organizations, below, with the 30 community education development and assistance centers described in Part C2 and with Resource People Abstract No.'s 3, 6, 9, 16, 26, 32, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 54 and 55, in Part C4.

C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 1**

CA PALO ALTO

Information Project on Education: Network (IPEN)
810 Miranda Green
Palo Alto, California 94306

Contacts: Jackie Berman, or
Roberta Hollimon (415) 948-7425

IPEN is a statewide organization which promotes community participation in education. It was formed in 1978 to assist parents and community members in better understanding their role under California's new collective bargaining law for educational employees. IPEN has since broadened its activities to give assistance to participants of school councils and other decision-making bodies. Currently, IPEN is identifying successful school involvement activities for single and working parents and promoting strategies which school councils may use to create more effective programs.

Field services are offered to citizens advisory councils, civic and community groups, and parents or parent organizations. IPEN facilitates coalition building among educational interest groups on the local and state levels and sponsors meetings to inform the community of school involvement activities.

IPEN also provides training in school program assessment and publications on parent involvement and improving instruction. These include: Building Effective School Site Councils, You, the Schools, and Effective Bargaining, and Citizen Participation in the California School Improvement Program. They also publish a newsletter, "You and the Schools."

See also, Part C4, Resource People Abstract No.'s 3, 6 and 9.

C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 2**

CT NEW HAVEN

Yale Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy
Box 11A, Department of Psychology
2 Hillhouse Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06510

CONTACT: Lynn Kagan, Assistant Director

The Yale Bush Center, with the support of the Bush Foundation of St. Paul, Minnesota, is dedicated to hastening the development of constructive social policy for children. It specializes in training individuals in both the social sciences and policy analysis in order to bridge the gap between research and social action. Bush fellows are investigating day care, child custody, child abuse, and mainstreaming, and other topics. The Center publishes policy position statements and sponsors national conferences on child and family problems.

The Yale Bush Center provides training in the use of community resources and technical assistance in project planning, needs assessment, group process, project evaluation, research design, school program assessment, and school climate. They are willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory councils, parents and parent organizations, and civic and community groups.

A recent involvement was the "Cognitive Levels Matching Project," at the Shoreham-Wading River School District. The Yale Bush Center designed the project and performed the evaluation.

See also Part C4, below, Resource People Abstract No. 16.

C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 3

MD BALTIMORE

Center for Social Organization of Schools (CSOS)
3505 North Charles Street
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218 (301) 338-7570

Contact: Joyce L. Epstein

A university-based institution, the Center specializes in basic research and policy-related analysis on the ways schools are organized and on how they can relate to the community in ways that promote student learning. It has recently completed a major study of parent involvement in their children's education, a study which among other topics focused on how and whether increased contact between schools and families affects student performance. Current school improvement emphases include: individualized and group instruction, the allocation of time (i.e., "time-on-task") in schools and classrooms and use of microcomputers in classroom instruction.

The Center provides training and technical assistance on project planning, needs assessment, group process, project evaluation, curriculum planning and school climate. Field service is provided to citizens advisory councils, and to civic and parent organizations as well as to school administrators, staff and policymakers.

See also Part C4, below, Resource People Abstract No. 26.
The Center also has an extensive publications program and publishes a newsletter, "CSOS Report," which highlights new developments in educational research and practice.

C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 4**

MA CHELMSFORD

Merrimack Education Center (MEC)
101 Mill Road
Chelmsford, Massachusetts 01824 (617) 256-3958

Contact: Dr. Richard J. Lavin

The Merrimack Education Center is a consulting organization which serves 22 cities and towns in the Merrimack Valley. It seeks to foster collaboration between school districts through surveys of region-wide problems that demonstrate whether a co-operative plan meets local needs, and they act as a switching center for information dissemination of successful practices. Inquiries are answered and special assistance provided to install and adopt programs. Their aim is to strengthen local programs and form links to resources by making applied research, dissemination and development available through workshops, teacher training and consulting. In their view, regional collaboration provides cost-benefits to schools through sharing advanced knowledge and informed practices.

The Center provides training and technical assistance on project planning, needs assessment, use of community resources, community surveys, research design, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices and measuring pupil achievement. They provide training in school-community relations, school volunteer programs, and parent involvement in instruction. Technical assistance is offered in fundraising/proposal writing. Field services are provided to teachers, administrators, parents, students, community organizations, and state Department of Education staff.

MEC has a large computerized program improvement bank that includes collections of available practices, programs, training materials, curriculum materials, descriptions of verified projects and inventories of product sources. All practices are described in reports and available in infomation packets to school practitioner groups. Other informational resources include both ERIC and non-ERIC sources. The Center enables users to locate materials nationally through computer-linked information services.

NJ TRENTON

Schoolwatch, Inc.
200 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08608

Contact: Robert Woodford (Chairman of the Board)

Schoolwatch, Inc., is a non-profit coalition of business, civic and religious organizations that monitors implementation of New Jersey State education laws. Governed by a volunteer Board composed of prominent members of the business, political and religious communities, Schoolwatch seeks to intensify parent involvement in the public schools by educating parents.

Since 1982, Schoolwatch has given a 120 hour course, "Public Policy and the Public Schools." The course consists of 30 sessions which are a means to turn parent volunteers into well-informed educational activists. The objectives of the course are: (a) to enable parents to collect and evaluate information; (b) to teach them to work effectively in groups and to make written and public presentations; (c) to enable parents to describe, analyze and evaluate issues surrounding or involved in decisionmaking, equity and resource provision control; and (d) to enable parents to describe, analyze and evaluate issues of testing, discipline, parenting and curriculum development.

The "Public Policy and Public Schools" program design was based on St. Peter's College Public Policy Program for community activists and public sector workers. Schoolwatch recommends that in the lower division baccaulaureate/associate degree category, the nine credits be divided evenly between Political Science/Public Policy, Educational Psychology on Tests and Measurements, and Communications or Introductory Speech. The credits are given through Thomas A. Edison State College, and the classes are held at various New Jersey school districts.

Some of the topics for discussion are: "Key Concepts in Mastery Learning," "Improving Poor Student Writing," and "Relationship of Federal, State and Local Levels of Governance for Education." Small group exercises include: "Persuading Teachers to Implement Mastery Learning," and "Restoring a Basic Education Curriculum."

NY LONG ISLAND CITY

Advocates for Children of New York, Inc.
24-16 Bridge Plaza South
Long Island City, New York 11101

Contact: Jane R. Stern, Executive Director (212)729-8866

Advocates for Children (AFC) has become a prominent advocacy organization. Through their defense of the rights and entitlements of poor, handicapped and minority students, and through their interventions in policy issues critical to achieving access, equity, and effective instruction, AFC has brought equal education to many New York City students.

AFC's staff of advocates, attorneys and organizers responds to schooling needs by individual case advocacy and counseling, community organizing in poor and minority neighborhoods, training and technical assistance to advocacy groups and community-based agencies, system-wide policy analysis and advocacy, city-wide information, training services and coalition building, legal intervention and legislative advocacy at city, state and Federal levels, and links to state and national advocacy networks.

AFC has represented 20,000 individual families and students since 1970, intervened in thousands of administrative decisions to protect the rights of students, brought landmark class action proceedings to prohibit exclusionary policies, and with hundreds of district and city-wide school people, improved the quality of education provided to poor, minority and handicapped students.

They offer several publications for no charge, including their quarterly newsletter, "The Advocate," and a student's rights card. They also publish a Parents Resource Guide for $2.00, and Educational Services for At Risk Adolescents: A Program Evaluation Report (for $4.00) and a Digest of Administrative Decisions in New York City and New York State Involving Student Discipline (for $20.00).

NY NEW YORK CITY

Educational Priorities Panel
257 Park Avenue South, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10010

Contact: Robin Willner (212) 647-2121

The Educational Priorities Panel (EPP) is an independent civic organization representing a coalition of 25 major parent and civic organizations who advocate and work for an effective and efficient public school system in New York City. Locally, EPP conducts and publishes management and program evaluations of NYC school operations, and conducts parent workshops and public information campaigns.

EPP is ready to share its experience with other like-minded civic organizations in other cities and will respond to questions about how citizens can get involved in doing community surveys, evaluating school programs and administrative practices, and planning and evaluating community involvement projects.

See also Part C4, below, Resource People Abstract No. 42.

OH DAYTON

I/D/E/A School Improvement Program
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45429

Contact: Gil Johnson (513) 434-7300

I/D/E/A (Institute for Development of Educational Activities) is a research and development and technical assistance organization dedicated to educational improvement. Now a self-supporting, non-profit organization, it originated in 1966 as part of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation of Dayton, Ohio.

It has most recently initiated a network of local school improvement projects (see Practices Profile No. 33 in Part B, above) tied together by the consultation provided by I/D/E/A.

I/D/E/A has always seen educational improvement as a partnership among schools, parents and other community institutions. To that end, it provides training and technical assistance on the following topics: use of community resources, community surveys, advisory committee functioning, school climate, project planning, needs assessment, and group process.

See also Part C4, below, Resource People Abstract No. 45.

C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 9

OR EUGENE

Center for Educational Policy and Management (CEPM)
College of Education, University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Contact: Robert Mattson, Associate Dean and Director
of Research and Development (503) 686-5173

The Center for Educational Policy and Management is the Research and Development Unit of the College of Education's division of Educational Policy and Management, and has, since 1964, provided international leadership in educational administration. Their current focus is on staff development, secondary school organization, and administrative leadership.

CEPM provides training and technical assistance in the areas of project planning, needs assessment, project evaluation, research design, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction and school climate. Their priority area is administrative practices.

New publications include the guide, "Effective Schooling Practices and Teacher Evaluation: Beyond Ceremonial Congratulations," revised 1983. This guide, designed for use in workshops, reviews the evaluation process and the available research on teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness. Specific attention is paid to those variables affecting learning that are largely under the control of school personnel. Another noteworthy publication is "Specifying Determinants of Teacher and Principal Work," 1983. Direct and indirect determinants of teacher work, school climate and principal work, in a paradigm developed at CEPM, are specified to guide research linking educational policy and management with student achievement.

They have papers available on collective bargaining, conflict management and the required conditions for effective teaching. Their backlist of books (sold while supply lasts) includes works on school finance, organizational renewal, and strategies of consultation.

PA PHILADELPHIA

Research for Better Schools
444 Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

Contact: Dr. David Helms, Director, Basic Skills

Research for Better Schools is an agency which is currently collaborating with the New Jersey Department of Education to sponsor a training program for urban school districts interested in adopting the "Achievement Directed Leadership" program. Additional districts will be trained in the Achievement Directed Leadership program as part of an "Urban Initiative" developed by the Department of Education. Effective Schools Strategies will be provided to interested districts with technical assistance support. Their speciality is developing school effectiveness practices designed to improve student performance in basic skills.

Research for Better Schools provides both training and technical assistance on: project planning, group process, research design, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices, and measuring pupil achievement. Technical assistance only is given for project evaluation, training only for needs assessment. Field services is given to teachers, administrators, students, and state Department of Education staff.

They provide publications on project planning, project evaluation, research design, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices, and measuring pupil achievement.

C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 11**

TX AUSTIN

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL)
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Contact: David Williams (512) 476-6861

SEDL focuses on research, development, technical assistance and information to meet educational needs of their region. They are particularly concerned about the needs of special populations, because of the nature of the region's demographics. They maintain that any current agenda for education must address the need for literacy in language, mathematics, science, and computer technology. A current study is "The Significant Bilingual Instruction Study," which seeks to establish a firm research base from sufficient empirical evidence. They are documenting successful programs in order to help other schools to know what elements go together to create successful bilingual instruction. Several of their projects focus on parental involvement in learning: "Working Parents Project," the "Parent Involvement in Education Project," and the "Follow Through" program, which incorporates home and school activities to help children build on their strengths.

SEDL provides technical assistance in needs assessment, project evaluation, school-community relations, and parent involvement to teachers, administrators, and State Department of Education staff.

They publish a newsletter, "Communique," and they disseminate information about successful programs through the SEDL/BES Dissemination Project. This project is refining and modifying successful curriculum materials developed by the Basic Educational Skills Projects in local schools and Head Start programs, in order to develop prototypes. These prototypes will be disseminated to state Department of Education and training will be offered to state agency staff in working with local elementary schools.

See also Part C4, below, Resource People Abstract No. 48.

VA ALEXANDRIA

Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center
228 South Pitt Street, Room 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Contact: Winifred Anderson (703) 836-2951

The Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center (the Parent Center), a non-profit corporation founded in 1978, assures appropriate educational opportunities for handicapped children by training their parents to work collaboratively with school personnel in planning special education programs. The training courses designed and implemented by the Parent Center staff include: "Understanding Special Education," a 7-hour introductory course which explains the special education process to parents; "Action Planning in Education," a 15-hour comprehensive course which provides parents with the necessary skills and knowledge to become advocates for their child's educational needs; "Next Steps: PlAnning for Employment," a workshop for parents to assist them in planning for their child's vocational education and employment opportunities, and "Mastering the Maze," a four-day program that trains parent/professional teams to organize and conduct courses for parents in their communities.

In the State Model Progam, state education agencies contract with the Parent Center to assist local education agencies in providing comprehensive services to parents of handicapped children. In a local school district a core team, comprised of a parent of a handicapped child and an educator, is trained to: identify needs of parents in their community; conduct training courses for parents and professionals to promote cooperative educational planning; provide resources and training for parents to work with their children at home; develop a parent-to-parent network; and establish a community information and referral system.

Center staff will also provide training and technical assistance to civic and community groups. A recent client of such training is: Montgomery County Association for Retarded Citizens, 16600 Nevel Street, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

Fee for service negotiable. No travel or time restrictions.

C3: RESOURCES: ORGANIZATIONS **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 13**

VA ARLINGTON

American Association of School Administrators
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Contact: Gary Marx (703) 528-0700

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) is a professional organization for educational leaders. The membership of 17,000 includes superintendents, deputy, associate, and assistant superintendents, directors, coordinators and other central office administrators, building level administrators, school board members, and professionals from higher education. AASA holds a national conference annually and their Office of Governmental Relations sponsors a yearly conference to teach school executives about the processes of the Federal government as they pertain to education.

AASA provides training to teachers, administrators, advisory council members, state department of education staff and school board members in the areas of needs assessment, group process, administrative practices, curriculum, program assessment, and measuring pupil achievement. AASA has held workshops concerning parent involvement, resulting in a bilingual handbook for parents about their role in children's education. It is also available in video form. They encourage businesses to become involved in education through their pamphlet, "Business in Education," and advocate school voluntering in their booklet, "Partners in Education."

AASA's publications lists includes other books on school-community relations, time-on-task, and the demographics of the future, and a directory of resources for small school districts. It also publishes two quarterly newsletters, The Small School District Administrator, or The AASA Professor.

PART C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE

There are 56 individuals from 48 different communities in 27 states listed in these pages. These people represent a "living resource" for those seeking to improve their schools.

These people -- whom we are calling IRE Associates -- were identified through a query which we sent out to more than 70 individuals in the Spring of 1984. That mailing list was compiled out of nominations by the practitioners of school improvement, the leaders and staff of the more than 50 school improvement projects described in Part B, and the dozen or so organizations described in Part C3. We asked the practitioners: "What consultants or outside resource people have been most helpful to you?" and "Would you or other people at your school or organization be willing to provide help and advice to other school districts and groups?" We then asked the individuals thus nominated whether they would like to be listed in this Notebook as a step towards an emerging network of mutual aid to support school improvement.

The resulting list of Associates reflects the diversity of approaches and the diversity of constituencies which we have found to be involved in school improvement efforts. The following is a breakdown of the kinds of people now listed in the network.

ROLE GROUP		RESOURCE PEOPLE ABSTRACT NUMBERS
Practicing Educators	School District Staff	10, 12, 14, 23, 33, 36, 38, 40, 50
	Teachers/Project Directors	7, 22
	Principals	4, 12, 18, 19
	Superintendents	21, 51
State Education Agency Staff and Consultants		1, 15, 31, 37
Faculty at Colleges and Universities		5, 13, 16-17, 24-27, 29, 32, 29, 52
Community Educators		1, 11, 20, 28, 43, 46, 49, 53
Staff and Research and Development and Technical Assistance Centers and Organizations		44-45, 46, 48, 55

ROLE GROUP	RESOURCE PEOPLE ABSTRACT NUMBERS
Citizen Activists and Advocacy Group Leaders	2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 28, 34-35, 41-42, 54

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 1**

AZ PHOENIX COMMUNITY EDUCATION
STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

Lettie B. Cale
Arizona Department of Education
1935 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Lettie B. Cale has worked with community education programs since 1977, providing training to community educators, citizens, teachers, and administrators on topics of organizing advisory councils, needs assessment and planning, and evaluation. She is currently involved in a project designed to help schools improve their effectiveness called "Arizona's Best Bet: Effective Schools." Through this program schools receive assistance in developing action plans for improvement using results of current research on school effectiveness.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance and consulting help, documenter and evaluator of programs projects.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, community resources, school-business partnerships, advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, group process, fundraising, and proposal writing, school volunteers, project evaluation, community surveys, school program assessment.

She provides services to citizens, advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic or community groups. No set rates. Travel, food and lodging expenses outside of Arizona would have to be reimbursed. Recent clients include: Mrs. Shirley Fisher, Principal, Douglas School, 3302 N. Flowing Wells Road, Tucson, AZ 85705 (review of self-assessment instrument, development of actin plans for school improvement); Ms. Jack Rostal, Principal, Winkelman Primary School, P.O.Box 409, Winkelman, AZ 85292 (review of self-assessment instrument, development of action plan for school improvement).

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 2**

CA BEVERLY HILLS

CITIZEN ACTIVIST
COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
EDUCATION CHAIRPERSON

Roslyn Cooperman
9459 Hidden Valley Place
Beverly Hills, California 90210 (213) 271-2557

Roslyn Cooperman is a community activist in promoting educational improvement. Her focus has been on integration, innovation and parent involvement in the schools. Currently she is working on financial aid program support and educating parents on ways they can identify, utilize and evaluate school effectiveness components.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer, conductor of workshops and conferences. Provides technical assistance and consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school-business partnerships, advisory council functioning, community surveys.

She will provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees negotiable, will travel if reimbursed for expenses. No scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Community Relations Conference of Southern California, Education Chair, 4034 Buckingham Road, Los Angeles, CA 90008 (two conferences this year on citiens' role in effective schools); Los Angeles Public Schools Coalition, P.O.Box 48763, Los Angeles, CA 90048.

CA CUPERTINO

CITIZEN ACTIVIST
INFORMATION PROJECT ON EDUCATION:
NETWORK (IPEN)

Roberta Hollimon
11155 La Paloma Drive
Cupertino, California 95014 (408) 253-6078

Roberta Hollimon has had many years of experience working with community groups, both as participant and as a trainer. She has had numerous speaking engagements and has appeared as panelist on the topic of community participation in the collective bargaining process in education.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, school and community relations, parent involvement, group process.

She is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable. No travel limitations. Recent clients include: League of Women Voters, Palo Alto, 721 Ensign Way, Palo Alto, CA 94303 (panelist - Collective Bargaining as a Decisionmaking Process); San Ramon Valley Parents Council, 589 Bobbie Drive, Danville, CA 94526 (speaker on ways of involving the public in collective bargaining).

See also, Part C3, above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 1.

CA ELK GROVE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

William E. Webster
9401 Mazatlan Way
Elk Grove, California 95624 (916) 685-3588

William E. Webster is an Associate Professor of Education at California State College, Bakersfield. He has served as teacher and principal in California and Massachusetts, Director of Community Liaison with Harvard Project School House, Director of Community Governance Project in Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Washington, D.C., Director of Project Redesign, a New York State reform effort in the '70's, and Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Staff Development in the California State Department of Education.

Field Services:	Topic of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance and consulting and evaluator of programs and projects.	Organizing parents and citizens, school-community relations, use of community resources, advisory council functioning, project planning, group process, documentor fundraising/proposal writing.

He provides services for citizens advisory council members and civic or community groups. Fees are negotiable, will travel anywhere within U.S. Scheduling should be worked out well in advance. Recent clients: Citizen Action to Save Education, Orange County, CA (helped expand work in Central Valley of California, worked as lobbyist for it in Sacramento); Bakersfield City Elementary School District, Bakersfield, CA (developed a comprehensive school building principal effectiveness survey that was administered and is now being designed as a final report to set directions in principal training).

CA	ENCINITAS	PRINCIPAL

Bruce W. DeMitchell
Encinitas Union School Disrict
910 Melba Road
Encinitas, California 92024 (619) 753-5252

Bruce DeMitchell has worked with students and parents for 14 years. He has held many positions of increasing responsibility including teacher, coordinator, an principal. His major focus during the last couple of years has been on the effective schools movement. He has instituted clinical supervision and instruction in his schools.

Field Service:	Topics of Speciality:
Panelist, provider of technical assistance and consultant help.	School and community relations, improving instruction.

He is willing to provide services directly to parents and parent organizations. Fees are negotiable, with no travel limitations or limitations on scheduling. Recent client: Dr. Todd A. DeMitchell, Superintendent, Pauma School District, 33158 Cole Grade Road, Pauma Valley, CA 92061 (clinical supervision).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 6

CA LA JOLLA CITIZEN ACTIVIST

Janet Chrispeels
8703 Glenwich Lane
La Jolla, California 92037 (619) 292-3685

Janet Chrispeels is experienced in training school councils, parent groups, and developing parent volunteer programs. She is co-author of the manual describing the San Diego County School Effectiveness Program, and of *Schools and Communities Working Together*. She recently produced guides on "Building An Effective School" and is working with schools to develop a home/school component as part of their school effectiveness program.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer, conductor of workshops, and conferences.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school/business partnerships, advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessments, group process, school volunteers, community surveys, school program assessment, school climate.

She is willing to provide services directly to: citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, travel expenses would have to be reinbursed. Recent clients include: San Diego City Schools, Ricki Petrus, Coodinator, 4100 Normal St., San Diego, CA 92103 (assisted in developing parent education training program for four low-achieving schools); Central School, National City, 933 E. Ave., National City, CA 92050, Georgia Grijalua, Volunteer (assisted with development of a plan to increase parent involvement in the school).

See also Part C3 above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 1

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

CA LOS ANGELES TEACHER/PROJECT DIRECTOR

Sylvia G. Rousseau
Martin Luther King Legacy Association/Project AHEAD
4182 S. Western Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90028 (213) 295-8582

Sylvia G. Rousseau is currently serving as Director for Project AHEAD (Accelerating Home Education and Development), a parent education program sponsored by the Martin Luther King Legacy Association and funded by the Los Angeles Unified School District to promote stronger parent-school partnerships. She taught high school English for fifteen years. Her primary interest is fulfilling the mandate of public education through parent involvement and understanding the specific behaviors on the part of parents and schools which shape them both.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, project planning, needs assessment, group process, school climate.

She is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, travel plans depend on advance notice. In terms of scheduling, the later part of the week and Saturdays are preferable. Recent clients include: Mr. Alfred Moore, Principal, 95th St. Preparatory School, 1109 W. 96th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90002; Ms. Claire Sizgorich, Principal, Wilmington Park Elementary School, 1140 Mahar Ave., Wilmington, CA 91356 (these are two of the ten schools where Project AHEAD is operating).

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 8**

CA LOS ANGELES CITIZEN ACTIVIST
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF LOS ANGELES

Jean F. Cohen
3256 Corinth Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90066 (213) 397-6209

Jean F. Cohen has been involved as a community activist with public education since 1965. She has helped establish, and has chaired, local school-community advisory councils within the Los Angeles Unified School District. She has also been Education Consultant for the League of Women Voters since 1973.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer.	Organizing parents/citizens, school community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, advisory council functioning.

She will provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic or community groups. Fees are negotiable. Travel preferred within the state of California, primarily within Southern California. Recent clients include: Community Relations Conference of Southern California, Julian Keiser, Director, 4034 Buckingham Road, Los Angeles, CA 90008 (Ms. Cohen planned committees for education conferences); California Task Force for Integrated Education, Dr. Randall Lindsey, President, P.O.Box 3871, Los Angeles, CA 90051 (Ms. Cohen participated in the annual conference and edited the newsletter).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 9**

CA PALO ALTO

CITIZEN ACTIVIST
INFORMATION PROJECT ON
EDUCATION: NETWORK (IPEN)

Jackie Berman
810 Miranda Green
Palo Alto, California 94306 (415) 948-7425

Jackie Berman is a former teacher and Education Director of the League of Women Voters of California. She is now Director of IPEN, and Assistant Director of the Jewish Community Relations Council. In 1983, she attended the School Effectiveness Institute, at Michigan State University. She is knowledgeable in the area of school effectiveness and parent/community involvement and is an experienced speaker.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer of workshops and technical assistance, consultant work.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization conferences, school effectiveness and parent/community roles.

She provides services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic or community groups. Fees are negotiable. In terms of scheduling, booking far in advance is required. She has prepared workshops for the following organizations: Santa Clara County Office of Education, 100 Skyport Drive, San Jose, CA 95115 (408/947-6534); Jean Gary, League of Women Voters of the Monterey Peninsula, P.O. Box 1995, Monterey, CA 93942.

See also Part C3, above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 1.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 10**

CA SANTA BARBARA SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF OR CONSULTANT

Susan J. Ham
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road
Santa Barbara, California 93117 (805) 964-4711

Susan Ham has been with the office of the County Superintendent of Schools, Santa Barbara, since 1978. She began in the Community Education Center and is currently serving as Community Resource Specialist in Community/School Partnerships. Her background includes lecturing workshops and consultations as well as community/classroom work and planning and presenting large scale school events that include community partnerships. She has also done extensive work in special education.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization effectiveness, school/community relations,use of community resources, school/business partnerships, project planning, school volunteers, school curriculum areas: particularly teaching through games of play, social aspects of school life, art activities using free resources, and community recreation.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; travel limited to California. Days available: Monday through Friday only. Recent clients include: Santa Barbara County Parks Department, Frank Lauran, 610 Mission Canyon Road, Santa Barbara, CA (consultation and community needs assessment); Community Resource Information Service, Debbie Karoff, Post Office Box 2478, Santa Barbara, CA (coordinating county-wide workshop on volunteers and schools).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 11**

CA SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Bruce Braciszewski
Center for Community Education
San Diego County Office of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, California 92111 (619) 292-3685

Bruce Braciszewski is currently the director of the San Diego Center for Community Education. He is also Project Consultant of the Community Education Project for the California State Department of Education, and a board member of the National Community Education Association. He has published many articles on effective community councils and worked on many California committees in the area of citizen participation.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting.	School/community relations, parent involvement, school/business partnerships, school volunteers, project evaluation, community surveys.

He is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parent and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitation.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 12**

CA SAN DIEGO SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF
PRINCIPAL

Jack Hill
San Diego County Office of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, California 92111 (619) 292-3883

Dr. Jack Hill is enthusiastic about the potential of community and school people acting in partnerships to solve common problems. School morale and positive climates can make a difference in the performance, productivity, and satisfaction of those involved. Dr. Hill has been a teacher (elementary and secondary), special projects coordinator, middle school principal, and is currently the director of the Teacher Education and Computer Center for Region 15, covering San Diego and Imperial Counties.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops, and conferences.	School/community relations, school/business partnerships, advisory council functioning, and group process.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, daily rate $350.00 per day plus expenses. No travel limitations, no scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Conference on Education, 5600 Oakland Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri (addressed 26th Annual Meeting); National Conference of Christians and Jews, 348 W. Market Street - Suite 306, San Diego, CA 92101 (spoke on "Our Pluralistic Society in Transition: A View to the Future").

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 13**

CA SAN DIEGO INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Albert M. Ochoa
College of Education
Department of Policy Studies
San Diego State University
San Diego, California 92182 (619) 265-5155

Albert M. Ochoa is a professor of education at San Diego State University. His expertise in community leadership training, educational equity, and bilingual desegregation has enabled him to serve over 120 school districts and 40 educational agencies in addressing quality education. He teaches in the Department of Policy Studies in Language and Cross Cultural Education at San Diego State University.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, project evaluation, community surveys, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, school climate, administrative practices, bilingual desegregation.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations. Fees are negotiable. In terms of travel, California is his first priority, the Southwest his second, the rest of the United States his third. Scheduling is open with advance notice of more than two weeks. Recent clients include: California State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacremento, CA (organizing Hispanic Advisory Council to Superintendent); Coalition of Families for Education, Pico Rivera, CA (assisted in conference design and implementation on Educational Futures).

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 14**

CA SAN JOSE SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF OR CONSULTANT

Deborah Weinberg
Santa Clara County Office of Education
100 Skyport Drive (MC 237)
San Jose, California 95115 (408) 947-6585

Deborah Weinberg is currently directing a project funded by the David and Lucile Pickard Foundation to develop administration training in instructive leadership based upon the school effectiveness research. She formerly held the position of Director of Instructional Services for the Milpitas Unified School District. She has been a high school principal, assistant principal, and an English teacher. She is also active in a variety of professional organizations and activities and makes frequent presentations to educational groups.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Parent involvement, advisory council functioning, improving administrative practices.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Pete Mesa, Chief Deputy of Public Instruction, California State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall. Sacramento, CA 95814 (work with community advisory groups and school board of Milpitas Unified School District); Marsha Weil, Director - School Effectiveness Project, Santa Clara County Office of Education, 100 Skyport Drive, San Jose, CA 95115 (School effectiveness workshop series; District consultation).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 15**

CT HARTFORD STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

William J. Gauthier, Jr.
Chief, Bureau of School and Program Development
Connecticut State Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut 06115 (203) 566-5079

William Gauthier has been a teacher in elementary and secondary schools in suburban, rural and urban districts, a school administrator, a university professor, and now serves as a state education agency official.

He is Director for the Connecticut School Effectiveness Project, which has pioneered in developing a needs assessment model whereby schools can examine the following characteristics associated with instructional effectiveness: safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn and time-on-task, monitoring of student progress, and home school relations. The model also provides for action plans, based on the needs assessment data, designed to improve student achievement.

Services Offered	Topics of Speciality
Speaker, trainer, workshop presenter, project evaluator	School program assessment, improving instruction, measuring pupil achievement

Services are available directly to citizens groups and advisory committees. Fees are negotiable. There are no travel, geographic or scheduling limitations.

Previous clients have included state education agencies (Arkansas, Mississippi, Ohio, and West Virginia) and local school districts: Ft. Meyers and Orlando, Florida.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 16**

CT NEW HAVEN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Sharon Lynn Kagan
97 Loomis Place
New Haven, Connecticut 06511 (203) 436-1592
Yale University

Sharon L. Kagan is Associate Director of the Yale Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, and is Assistant Professor of Education at the Child Study Center at Yale University. Formerly a director of Head Start and Project Developmental Continuity Programs, Dr. Kagan has lectured and written in the areas of child care, education policy, parent involvement, and parent education. She has recently co-edited Children, Families and Government: Perspectives in American Social Policy.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker.	Parent involvement, community surveys, research design, administrative practices.

Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Northwest Area Foundation, First National Bank Building, St. Paul, MN (conducted review of competitive funding proposal aimed at promoting school change via collaborative decisionmaking); University of South Carolina, Psychology Department, Columbia, SC (keynote speaker on "Parent Involvement Research: The State of the Art").

See also Part C3, above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 2.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 17**

CT STORRS INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

John W. Brubacher
School of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268 (203) 486-4030

John W. Brubacher is an experienced teacher in the public schools and is now a professor in the School of Education at the University of Connecticut. He has worked extensively in the field of school board/superintendent relations, organizational development and school effectiveness. He has also done consulting work in the field of superintendent searches over the past thirteen years in the states of Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Texas.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations. parent involvement, advisory council functioning, project planning, group process, community surveys, school climate, administrative practices.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Reverend Edwin Edmonds, Board President, New Haven Public Schools, Orange Street, New Haven, CT (development of an Urban Academy); Dr. David Cattanoch, Superintendent of Schools, Waterford Public Schools, Waterford, CT (comprehensive school plan).

GA ATLANTA **PRINCIPAL**

Edwina W. Hill
2115 Jones Road, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30318 (404) 525-6165
(404) 525-1559

Edwina Hill is presently employed as the principal of a black inner-city elementary school in Atlanta. During her tenure, she has been instrumental in the organization of programs designed to improve instruction, to improve student achievement, to develop volunteer programs, to establish a school/business partnership, and to develop and implement a community involvement program.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization effectiveness, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school/business partnerships.

She is willing to provise services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable. In terms of travel she must limit herself to the Southeast, however, that will change after her dissertation is completetd. Recent clients include: Apple Corps., Inc., 250 Georgia Avenue SE, Atlanta, GA 30312 (speaker on "Making Schools Work").

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 19**

GA ATLANTA PRINCIPAL

Betty L. Strickland
617 Montevista Street, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30310 (404) 758-0848

Betty L. Strickland served as elementary school principal from 1977 through 1983 and is now acting principal at Inwan Middle School. Actively involved in promoting school volunteer programs, she initiated the first school/religious partnerships in Atlanta Public Schools. She has gained wide recognition for her prominent role in promoting academic progress through volunteer assistance.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences	School/community relations, parent involvement, school volunteers, school climate.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel limitations; weekends are preferred. Recent clients include: Association for Individually Guided Education, Atlanta, GA (presented "Student Misbehavior: What to do about it"); Apple Corps, 250 Georgia Avenue SE, Atlanta, GA (spoke on "Making Schools Work").

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 20**

HI HONOLULU COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Vivian S. P. Ing
7170 Niumalu Loop
Honolulu, Hawaii 96825 (808) 395-0335

Vivian S. P. Ing is interested in facilitating home, school, and community relations at the family, school building, and state levels. Formerly an elementary school teacher, she went on to be the director of Project "Ohana", a community education conference in 1978, and chairperson of the Aha Kuwa Coalition.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consulting, producer of slide/tape presentations.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, group process, school volunteers, history of education.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; willing to travel within Hawaii. Recent clients include: Mr. Arthur Wong, Principal, Kamiloiki Elementary School, 5633 Halekamani, Honolulu, HI 96821 (She led a group of parents in designing and writing a proposal called the "Ohana Project", and directed its implementation. It established a family/community center at Kamiloiki School with a distinctive home/school/community process.); Mr. Noboru Higa, director, Adult and Early Childhood Section, Department of Education, 595 Depulso Street H-2, Honolulu, HI 96825 (She wrote a proposal and led the Aha Kuka Coalition to train citizens interested in supporting education in leadership and networking skills. The object was to empower local communities within a centralized school system).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 21**

IL LAKE FOREST SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

Allen J. Klingenberg
95 W. Deerpath
Lake Forest, Illinois 60045 (312) 234-6010

During the past twelve years Allen J. Klinganberg has been a practicing school superintendent. In that capacity he has organized and implemented the only performance pay plan in operation in the country. His performance pay plan is based strictly on the performance of teachers and is determined by principal evaluation, goal achievement of the teachers, and their overall performance in the school district. In addition, he has conducted extensive surveys to receive feedback from parents and integrated the results and the performance pay plan into a total "management by objectives" system.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, and conferences, provider of technical assistance and consulting, documenter and evaluator of programs and projects	School/community relations, parent involvement, needs assessment, project evaluation, community survey, school program assessment, measuring pupil achievement, performance pay systems.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members and parents and parent organizations. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Oak Grove Schools, IL (teacher evaluation); East Moline Public Schools, East Moline, IL.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 22**

IL LAKE FOREST TEACHER/PROJECT DIRECTOR

Barbara O. Taylor
Box 758
Hobe Sound, Florida 33455 (305) 546-7270

1551 N. Green Bay Road
Lake Forest, Illinois 60045 (312) 295-7270

Barbara O. Taylor has had many years of experience in both community planning and education. In New Haven, she planned outreach and intern programs with certain public schools and assisted in the development of a School Volunteers Program which included tutoring. She has also taught at the seventh grade level. In the field of political strategy, she has lobbied for the funding of daycare centers, housing and drug abuse centers. At present, she is a Ph.D. candidate at Evanston, and is now completing her dissertation in Administration and Policy Studies.

Field Services	Topics of Speciality
Technical assistance, consulting help	School/community relations, use of community resources, school/business partnerships, project planning, needs assessment, school volunteers, project evaluation, community surveys, school climate, administrative practices

She is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, and civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, with no geographic or travel limitations at this time.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 23**

IN HAMMOND SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF

Raymond J. Golarz
5935 Hohman Avenue
Hammond, Indiana 46320 (219) 932-5700

Raymond Golarz is the supervisor of attendance, child welfare, and discipline services for the Hammond Public Schools. Since 1981 he has been supervising the city-wide activities of the Kettering I/D/E/A School Improvement Project in Hammond. He has taken this process involvement model and recently applied it to a community drug prevention training model for Indiana communities. He has also applied the model to gifted community involvement. He is a recent recipient of the Friend of the Child award.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, organizer of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school/business partnerships, advisory council functioning, group process, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Mr. Ron Lynch, Highland Public Schools, 9241 41st Street, Highland, IN 46322 (He is providing process/shared ownership training for the town of Highland community drug prevention effort.); Mrs. Beverly Zawa Isk, president - Hammond P.T.A. Council, 6616 Arkansas Avenue, Hammond, Indiana 46323 -- Hammond PTA Council, 6616 Arkansas Avenue, Hammond, Indiana, 46323 (providing shared decisionmaking/ownership leadership training for four community leadership groups in drug prevention efforts.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

IN INDIANAPOLIS INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Gary L. Phillips
Butler University
Robertson Hall - Room 219
4600 Sunset Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46208

Gary Phillips has been a university professor at Simon Frazer University in British Columbia and Butler University in Indiana. He spent twelve years working with delinquent youth and developed an innovative educational program called Pontoon III. He has also developed a program for gifted and talented youth called Learning Unlimited and is currently director of the I/D/E/A (Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc.) effort at secondary school improvement. In his current position he is engaged in a national effort co-sponsored by the Charles F. Kettering Foundation and Lilly Endowment to improve public secondary schools. Their focus is on a building-based model which builds the capacity of local participants and creates new roles for community, students, parents, and professional staff.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school/business partnerships, project planning, needs assessment, group process.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Recent clients include: Tom Rosenberger, Principal - George Washington High School, 2215 W. Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46222, (317) 266-40033; Bill McColly, Principal - Lawrence Norton High School, 7802 Hague Road, Indianapolis, IN 46256, (317) 849-9455.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 25**

KS OVERLAND PARK INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Daniel U. Levine
7000 W. 99th Street
University of Missouri at Kansas City
Overland Park, Kansas 66204 (816) 276-2251

Dan Levine taught at secondary schools in Chicago and then joined the University of Missouri where he has been conducting research on urban education for twenty years. Most of his research has been concentrated on compensatory education, desegregation, and, in recent years, effective school approaches. Several of his recent studies have dealt with organizational and instructional arrangements at unusually effective schools.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Project planning, needs assessment, project evaluation, research design, school program assessment, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices, measuring pupil achievement.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Ceric Cooper, College Board Degrees of Reading Power Program, 888 7th Avenue, New York, NY 10106 (joint planning and research); Dave Wallace, Director of Staff Development, Kansas City Public Schools, 1211 McGee, Kansas City, MO 64106 (consultant on effective schools project).

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE — RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 26

MD BALTIMORE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Joyce L. Epstein
Center for Social Organization of Schools
Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218 (301) 338-7570

Joyce L. Epstein, Principal Research Scientist and Associate Professor of Sociology, is author of the Quality of School Life Scale, editor of and contributor to two books, The Quality of School Life and Friends in School, and the author of numerous publications on the effects of contrasting school, classroom and family environments on student learning and development. Currently he is conducting research on teacher practices of parent involvement in school and their effects on students, parents, and teachers.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Parent involvement, project evaluation, research design, school program assessment, improving instruction, school climate, teacher practices of parent involvement, classroom organization and student outcomes.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel limitations. Consulting days are limited to about 20 per year. Recent clients include: Indianapolis Public Schools, Alice Davis, Coordinator of Parents in Touch Program (2 day workshop on teaching practices and parent involvement with teachers, principals, and other school administrators); Quebec Educators Professional Development Seminar Series, Geoffrey Isherwood, McGill University (Workshop and Lecture on the Quality of School Life: an organizational approach to school improvement).

See also Part C3, above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 3.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 27

MD COLLEGE PARK INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Ed Trickett
Department of Psychology
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742 (301) 454-6897

Ed Trickett has a professional interest in the relationship between citizens and researchers to develop valid and useful data on the issue of community interest and citizen empowerment as part of the research process. He has done post-doctoral research at Stanford University and taught at Yale University and the University of Maryland.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consulting help, documentor and evaluator of projects.	School/community relations, needs assessment, group process, project evaluation, community surveys, research design, school climate, measuring pupil achievement.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members and parent and parent organizations. Fees are negotiable; no geographic or travel limitations.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 28**

ME FARMINGTON CITIZEN ACTIVIST
COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Rosemary Poulson
Crooked Lines, Inc.
81 High Street
Farmington, Maine 04938 (207) 778-2860 ext.241

After a long career in business, Ms. Poulson has involved herself for the last seven years in the educational field. While continuing her own graduate studies, she works as an advocate of parents and taxpayers, as well as coordinator for a consortium of community educators at the state level. She has designed research projects on community education, teacher inservice, cost effectiveness, demographics, and other related topics. She has also convened a resource support group for single parents and organized students to change financial aid policy through affirmative action, the financial aid office, and university administration. Ms. Poulsen has, in addition, given many presentations on community education resources.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization effectiveness, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, advisory council functioning, project planning.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parent and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no scheduling limitations. Travel expenses must be reimbursed. Recent clients include: Maine Council for Community Education, David McCullough - Director, DACE/DECS, Station #23, Augusta, ME 04333 (co convenor, staff writer, coordinator); Chapter 1, ECIA Unit, Dan Christie, DECS, Station #23, Augusta, ME 04333 (research, write and follow-through production of booklet on parent involvement in education).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 29**

MA BOSTON INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING

Karl H. Clauset, Jr.
Boston University School of Education
605 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Karl Clauset's interests include school effectiveness, organizational change and computer simulation modeling for policy analysis. He has had a decade of experience in secondary schools in Africa and Southeast Asia. His doctorate is in Educational Leadership and his dissertation, "Effective Schooling: A Systems Dynamics Policy Study" won an award from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in 1983.

Field Services:	Topics or Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Project planning, needs assessment, fund raising/proposal writing, school program assessment, improving instruction, administrative practice, school effectiveness.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no geographic or travel limitations. Recent clients include: Roanoke Public Schools, Roanoke, VA (He and Alan Gaynor held a 2 day conference for 70 school administrators on building level management and school effectiveness.); Administrators Conference - August 1983, Montreal (Keynote speaker along with Alan Gaynor: "Measuring School Effectiveness: A Systems Perspective" (published as IRE Report #6).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 30**

MA BOSTON SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF

Jorge M. Cardoso
55 Northbourne Road
Boston, Massachusetts 02130 (617) 524-1764

Jorge Cardoso is currently a doctoral student at Boston University. He has taught bilingual classrooms, coordinated an innovative staff development program, and served as community relations specialist for the schools of Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, and conferences, technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, group process.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parent and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel limitations. Recent clients include: Greater Lowell Regional Technical School (Title VII Program Evaluator); Tri-State Bilingual Parent Training Conference (speaker).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 31**

MA WABAN STATE EDUCATION AGENCY CONSULTANT

Cynthia A. Gilles
667 Chestnut Street
Waban, Massachusetts 02168 (617) 969-6591

Cynthia Gilles has been employed by several state and regional special education agencies and projects. She has worked with a variety of parent and community organizations, school districts, advisory committees, institutes of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations. She is presently with the Center for Social Acceptance, providing consultation on proposal and organizational development, assisting in locating human and other resources and working on project development, management, and evaluation.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consulting, documentor and evaluator of programs and projects.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization, effectiveness, parent involvement, advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, group process, proposal writing, project evaluation, administrative practices, personnel development, planning and managing change, inter-organizational (interagency) collaborations.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel limitations, but scheduling must be done at least six weeks in advance. Recent clients include: Dr. Gary Saperstein, College of Public and Community Services, University of Massachusetts - Boston, 100 Arlington Street, Boston, MA., and Mr. Robert T. Kennedy, Special Education Section, New Hampshire Department of Education, 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 32**

MI EAST LANSING INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Lawrence W. Lezotte
418 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824 (517) 353-9024

Lawrence Lezotte has been extensively involved in the research on effective schools. Recently, in collaboration with the late Ron Edmonds, he has assisted local schools in planning and implementing school improvement programs based on the effective school research findings. Professor Lezotte is the editor of a newsletter titled "The Effective School Report." This newsletter has received acclaim from parents, administrators, and teachers.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, provider of technical assistance, consulting.	Needs assessment, project evaluation, research design, school program assessment, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices, measuring pupil achievement.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members and parents and parent organizations. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Kellogg Foundation, Instructional Leadership Training Program; Jackson, Mississippi Public Schools: Improvement Program.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 33

MI WAYNE SCHOOL DISTRICT CONSULTANT

Karen Roth
Wayne County Intermediate School District
33500 Van Born Road
Wayne, MI 48184 (313) 467-1585

Karen Roth taught English, reading, and humanities at the junior and senior high school levels. She then became a staff development consultant with a substance abuse prevention program and worked with educators and parents from 36 local school districts in Wayne County. Currently, she is a general education consultant working with school districts, both locally and nationally, on school improvement projects, school climate, effective education, and gifted education.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	School/community relations, parent involvement, group process, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction school climate, administrative practices, parent/child and teacher/student relationships.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parent and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel limitations but prefers to work weekdays. Advance scheduling of a month is needed. Recent clients include: Ecouse High School, 4165 7th Street, Ecouse, MI 48229, (313) 682-6322 (comprehensive high school improvement project); Greece Central High School District, 1790 Latta Road, Greece, NY 14515, Dr. Jerry Herman - Superintendent, (71o) 621-1000 (school climate and effective schools).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE — RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 34

MN MINNEAPOLIS — CITIZEN ACTIVIST

Evy Fischlowitz
2760 Drew South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416 (612)920-9115

Evy Fischlowitz has had wide experience in special education and early childhood education. She was a founder of The Stepping Stones Nursery School, which pioneered in mainstreaming handicapped children with normal peers. She has acted as consultant to The Groves Learning Center on Early Childhood Special Education Services in Minneapolis and provided on-site technical assistance to 29 school districts in the West-Metro region. For the latter, she acted as a liaison between the state/region and agencies serving children and their families, and managed the flow of funds to the local districts. Ms. Fischlowitz has taught early childhood education at the graduate level, and has lectured and spoken on related topics at many conferences and seminars.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer of workshops, provider of technical assistance and consulting help	Organizing parents and citizens, school-community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, advisory council functioning, project planning, group process, school climate, special education mainstreaming

She is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, civic and community groups, parents and parent organizations. Fees are negotiable, no travel or scheduling limitations. A recent client was the Council on Quality Education, c/o Gene Kaires, 550 Cedar Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55101. She is a member of the Council which solicits RFP's from throughout Minnesota, K-12 grades in public schools, for cost-effective/innovative educational ideas.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 35**

MO ST. LOUIS CITIZEN ACTIVIST
PARENTS AS TEACHERS COMMITTEE

Jane Mitchell
9445 Bonhomme Woods Drive
St. Louis, Missouri 63132 (314) 993-3490

The Parents as Teachers Committee was appointed by the Missouri Commission of Education, Arthur Mallory, to promote citizen involvement in education. The committee is doing this by identifying local programs where parents are successfully involved in their children's education. This information is then disseminated free of charge, and upon request, through a resource notebook, slide tape show, and a video.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Provider of technical assistance, consulting.	Organizing parents and citizens, parent involvement, use of community resources.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parent and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees negotiable; no travel limitations. Will send resource materials to any group that requests them.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 36**

NE LINCOLN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT CONSULTANT

Constance H. Dembrowsky
Selection Research, Inc.
Post Office Box 5700
Lincoln, Nebraska 68505 (402) 489-0351

Constance Dembrowsky has worked on maintaining productive parental involvement with the schools for seventeen years. Formerly Wyoming coordinator for the National School Volunteer Program, she is now Executive Associate with Selection Research, Inc. Her writings include We Are All Special, a handbook for parents explaining special education, and Effective Skill Development for Adolescents, a curriculum program to develop student motivation and improve school performance, which includes a series of workshops to help parents interact effectively with their teenagers.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consulting.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, school volunteers, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel limitations. Sufficient prior notice is necessary due to other commitments. Recent clients include: Salt Lake City School District, Don Thomas - Superintendent, 440 E. 1st Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84111 (Held a 2 day in-service meeting for this district to increase the motivation and performance of high-risk students. An integral part of this program will be involving and training parents of high-risk students.); Billings Public Schools, Mr. Ned Laird, Executive Director of Public Schools, Billings Public Schools, 101 101st Street W., Billings, MT.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 37**

NJ TRENTON STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

Sylvia Roberts
Director, Division of Compensatory and Bilingual Education
New Jersey State Department of Education
CN 500, 225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625 (609) 984-2101

Sylvia Roberts is responsible for the management and operation of the Division of Compensatory and Bilingual Education of the New Jersey State Department of Education, which includes the ECIA Chapter I, State Compensatory Migrant and Bilingual Education programs. In this position, she directs and approves the allocation of grant funds totalling 200 million to local school districts and assists districts in the identification, development and implementation of long-range school improvement projects. She is directing a project designed to identify, disseminate, and implement effective Chapter I projects and management strategies for urban school districts, grades 7-12 in the thirteen states in Region I, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting.	Advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, group process, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, administrative practices.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 38**

NY BAYSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF
NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Terrence Quinn
217-47 54th Avenue
Bayside, New York 11364 (212) 631-2654

Terrence Quinn studied at Fordham College and Yeshiva University. His present position is Education Administrator, School Improvement Project, Office of Deputy Chancellor, and he serves as a consultant to the National Conference of Yeshiva Principals and the Office of Catholic Education, Archdiocese of New York. He has had diverse professional responsibilities as a teacher, community school board member, and staff supervisor.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, provider of techanical assistance, consulting.	Project planning, needs assessment, group process, school curriculum assessment, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are $150.00 per day plus expenses. Travel is limited to New England and the Mid-Atlantic states. No scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Sister Helen O'Neil, Assistant Superintendent of Catholic Education, 1101 1st Avenue, New York, NY (project planning, needs assessment, and administrative training); Stanley Fishman, Principal, Jewish Foundation School, 20 Park Hill Circle. Staten Island, NY 10304 (project planning, needs assessment, administrative training).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 39**

NY ITHACA INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Irving Lazar
145 Forest Home Drive
Ithaca, New York 14850 (607) 257-6767
(607) 256-7770

Irving Lazar has been involved in the design and implementation and evaluation of programs of service to families for over 35 years and has worked in Federal, state, and local agencies and in private organizations in health, education, and social services. He has assisted or consulted with schools and state agencies in all fifty states, in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific Basin.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, documentor & evaluator of workshops and conferences, provides technical assistance, consulting help.	Project planning, project evaluation, research design, program assessment.

He will provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parent and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, usually $500 per day plus expenses, based on time away from Ithaca, NY, includes travel time plus full expenses, and nature of task. Recent clients include: State Department of Education, Maryland (evaluation of Early Childhood programs); British Association for Child Psychiatry and Psychology:Presentation on Effects of Early Education, New York State Department of Education - Superintendents Workshops.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 40**

NY NEW YORK SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF
NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dennis P. McCarthy
3910 Seton Avenue
Bronx, New York 10466 (212) 994-3160

Dennis McCarthy is a psychologist with training and experience in organizational development, research and program evaluation, environmental/community psychology and child therapy. He has been involved in the New York City School Improvement Project since its inception under Ron Edmonds in 1979. Currently, he is the project manager of the High School Improvement Project in the New York City Public Schools.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consultant, documentor and evaluator of programs and projects.	Advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, group process, project evaluation, community surveys, research design, school program assessment, school climate, measuring pupil achievement, school-based constituency planning (school improvement process).

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Community Education Leader's Renewal Institutes (presenter and workshop leader);Robert L. Green and Associates, Memphis Effective Schools Project, In-service Workshop (Workshop leader).

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 41**

NY NEW YORK

CITIZEN ACTIVIST
UNITED PARENTS ASSOCIATION

Steven D. Redfield
United Parents Association
95 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016 (212) 685-3563

Steven D. Redfield is presently director of United Parents Associations of New York City, Inc. It provides information, training and technical assistance and represents parents on Educational Policy Committees, at public hearings, and at the state and federal levels. Through parent organizing, it helps to strengthen the role of parents in New York City's school system. Previously, he was staff associate for INTERFACE,* researching, and monitoring Board of Education policies, and preparing analysis for the panel.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, advisory council functioning, group process, school volunteers, community surveys, school climate, school curriculum areas.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; prefers to work in New York City. No scheduling limitations.

---

* See Resource Person Abstract No. 42, below.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE — RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 42

NY NEW YORK — CITIZEN ACTIVIST INTERFACE

Robin Willner
257 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10010 (212) 674-2121

Robin Willner works on the Education Priorities Panel of INTERFACE, a non-profit, public policy research, training and advocacy agency striving to make city government more efficient. The Educational Priorities Panel is a coalition of 26 parent and civic organizations that conducts research and advocacy to improve the financial aid management of public education in New York City. They have helped groups form similar coalitions in other major cities, resulting in increased funding available for classroom services.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization effectiveness, school/community relations, administrative practices.

Robin Willner is willing to provide services directly to parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no geographic or travel limitations. Scheduling is open. Recent clients include: Chicago Panel on School Finances, 53 West Jackson Blvd. Suite 1006, Chicago, IL 60604; Reverend Richard Israel, Greater Cleveland Interchurch Council, 2230 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44115 (These are two of the coalitions participating in education budget decision-making based on the model of the Educational Priorities Panel.

See also Part C3, above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 7.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 43**

NC BOONE COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Paul G. Kussrow
Appalachian State University
346 Duncan Hall
Boone, North Carolina 28706 (704) 262-2215

Paul G. Kussrow is currently director of the North Carolina Center for Community Education and Full Professor of Leadership in Higher Education. In addition to curriculum design and instruction, he has authored grants and coordinated and conducted training programs with the North Carolina Association of Community Education and the State Department of Public Instruction. His past service has included: Dean of Continuing Education and Community Services, Director of Career Education, Community School Administration, and public school teacher for grades 6-12.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, and conferrences, provider of technical assistance, consultant.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, group process, fundraising, proposal writing, school volunteers, project evaluation, community surveys, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school foundation, "adopt-a-school."

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organiztions, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no geographic or travel limitations. Recent clients include: Mr. Jim Watson, Community Schools Specialist, Northwest Regional Education Center, 303 E Street, North Wilkesboro, NC (provided advisory council training, foundation training, volunteer training); Ms. John Formy-Duval, President NC-ACE, Post Office Box 3823, Durham, NC 27102.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 44**

NC CARRBORO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER

Gayle Dorman
Center for Early Adolescence
Suite 223, Carr Mill Mall
Carrboro, North Carolina 27510 (919) 966-1148

Gayle Dorman is Director of Training at the Center for Early Adolescence. She is Developer of the Middle Grades Assessment Program (MGAP), a self-assessment and school improvement process designed especially for junior high and middle schools. In addition to training educators to use Middle Grades Assessment Program, she delivers speeches and conducts workshops on improving middle grade schools.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, provider of technical assistance, consultant.	Needs assessment, group process, school program assessment, school climate, middle grade education.

She is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel limitations but prefers not to travel weekends. Recent clients include: Helen Hatcher, Principal, Francisco Middle School, 2190 Powell Street, San Francisco, CA 94133; Gerald Tolen, Principal, Cooper Middle School, 849 North Mial Street, Clayton, NC 27520.

C4: RESOURCE: PEOPLE — RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 45

OH CENTERVILLE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER

Gil Johnson
I/D/E/A (Institute for the Development
of Educational Activities)
259 Regency Ridge
Centerville, Ohio 45459 (513) 434-6969

Gil Johnson is a contact person for I/D/E/A, which has worked since 1965 to improve education at the building level. Their current mission is to help school systems plan and implement programs. Sometimes the emphasis is on groups of principals, sometimes on school staffs, and sometimes both simultaneously. Programs are tailored to the specific needs of a school and a community and they involve all who have a stake in improving the school: parents, professionals, students, and community representatives.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help, documentor and evaluator of programs and projects.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization, effectiveness, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school/business partnerships, project evaluation, research design, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices.

He is willing to provide services directly to Citizens Advisory Council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no geographic or travel limitations. Recent clients include: Kenmore, town of Tonawanda, NY School Improvement Program (parents as co-facilitators, clinical supervision, principals in-service program); Cherokee Nation, Talequch, OK (school improvement, planning and evaluation of alternative school).

See also Part C2, above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 8.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 46**

OH CLEVELAND ADULT EDUCATION

Jane Schierloh
Merrick Settlement House
1050 Starkweather Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44113 (216) 771-5077

Jane Schierloh serves as Program Director of Merrick Institute, an adult eduction program of Merrick Settlement House. She writes basic reading, English, and math instructional materials which have proven effective with inner-city students. She recommends Gail Long, assistant director of Merrick Settlement, as an experienced community organizer who has worked with local parent groups as well as with city-wide coalitions on educational issues. One of their efforts was WELCOME, a successful city-wide endeavor to promote a peaceful community response to mandatory school desegregation.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consulting help, documenter and evaluator of programs and projects.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, project planning, group process, fundraising/proposal writing, school volunteers, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction.

She is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable; no travel or scheduling limitations. A recent client was Tremont Concerned Parents (TCP). It serves as an advocate to Tremont parents whose children attend Cleveland Public Schools. Group also addresses broader educational issues such as testing and budgets. Merrick House gives community organizations staff assistance.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 47**

SC COLUMBIA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER

Mary C. Jackson
School Advisory Council Assistance Project
Box 51, College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208 (803) 777-7658

Mary C. Jackson is with the School Advisory Assistance project, which is located in the College of Education at the University of South Carolina. It provides technical assistance, training, resources and publications to all schools in South Carolina as they work to improve public education through effective school advisory councils. The project is funded through the South Carolina General Assembly and the University and offers services, information, and resources on improving and promoting parent, teacher, and citizen involvwement in public education. Project staff and resources are available nationwide on a consulting basis.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organiser and conductor of workshops/conferences, technical assistance, and consulting. Provides services for citizen advisory council members, civic and community groups, parents and parent organizations.	Community organization, school/comunity relations, parent involvement, advisory council functioning, needs assessment, group process, community surveys, school program assessment, school curriculum areas, improving instruction, school climate, and administrative practices.

Fees are negotiable, travel (in general) unlimited, although it is preferred between Monday and Friday. Recent clients are: Richmond School District #1 Alcorn Middle School (school effectivness survey, training, assessment including inservice for teachers, interview for all faculty, advisory council training, and school improvement plan development); Clarendon District Middle School (assessment and training for Manning Middle School). Both school districts are in South Carolina.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 48**

TX AUSTIN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER

David L. Williams, Jr.
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701 (512) 476-6861 ext. 343

David L. Williams, Jr., has had major training in areas of curriculum and instruction and elementary and early childhood education. He has written extensively on parent involvement, family structures and teacher training, and has done consulting work for the Head Start Policy Advisory Committee in Nebraska, for the University of North Carolina, the Nebraska Public School System, and many other educational agencies.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, organizer and conductor of workshops, and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	School/community relations, parent involvement, school-business partnerships, community surveys.

He is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory councils members and parents and parent organizations. Fees are negotiable, would basically cover travel and per diem expenses. He would prefer to work in the states of Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and would consider Ohio, Nebraska and California. He states, "We do not have clients as such but do provide information to state Departments of Education, local educational agencies, professional teachers, principals, school administrators organizations, parent and civic organizations, and other research and development organizations."

See also Part C2, above, Resource Organization Abstract No. 11.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 49**

TX STEPHENVILLE COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Ann Kraatz Calahan
Box T-549
Tarleton Station
Stephenville, Texas 76402 (817) 968-6877

Ann Kraatz Calahan is a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Texas A & M University. She has worked for SCOPE (Texas Select Committee on Public Education), gathering data, and has planned and coordinated several conferences and workshops for the university. She has also worked with the Center for Community Education at Texas A & M, developing a model to integrate the K-12 and community education programs in the state of Texas.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consultant.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, school-business partnerships, needs assessment.

She will provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable. No travel limitations as long as travel stipends are provided. Recent clients include: Suzy Thompson, Director, Community Education, Bay City I.S.D., Bay City, Texas (consultant for K-12/C.E. Integration project); James Lang, Curriculum Director, Silsbee I.S.D., Silsbee, Texas (implemented the Better Learner Program to involve parents directly with teachers to build reading skills in children).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 50**

UTAH SALT LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF

Gene Berry
Salt Lake City Schools
440 East First South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 (801) 328-7346

Gene Berry has served for five years as the Coordinator of Volunteers for the Salt Lake City Schools, and has recruited and trained many volunteers in numerous capacities. He has also served in a leadership role in conducting shared governance training for the district. Currently, he is in the National School Volunteer Program. Two years ago he co-chaired the International Conference on Parent Citizen Involvement held in Salt Lake City, and now serves as the Utah Coordinator for the Consortium on Youth Volunteers.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conducter of workshops, provider of technical assistance, consulting.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school-business partnerships, advisory council functioning, school volunteers.

He is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic or community groups. The school district will give him time to travel with no fee other than travel expenses. When there is an honorarium, he will use vacation time. In terms of scheduling, weekdays are best. Recent clients include: Ned Hubbell, Dept. of Education, P.O.Box 30008, Lansing, Michigan 48909 (assisted in creating and managing school volunteer programs); Kathy Brimhall, State PTA, 736 East 1600 S. Volunteers Avenue, Orem, Utah 84057 (training on recruiting, retaining and recognizing volunteers).

UTAH SALT LAKE CITY SUPERINTENDENT

M. Donald Thomas
Salt Lake City School District
440 East First Street South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 (801) 328-7349

Donald Thomas has been Superintendent of the Salt Lake City school district for the last eleven years. He has also worked in the school systems of Illinois, New York, and California. Parent and public involvement in the schools being a major interest, he has written extensively on school-community partnership programs. He has had wide experience as a speaker, workshop presenter, and training consultant.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Trainer, panelist, speaker, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school-business partnerships, advisory council functioning, group process, school volunteers, improving instruction, school climate, administrative practices, measuring pupil achievement.

He is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic abnd community groups. Fees are negotiable to budget of group. No travel limitations. Scheduling limited to Friday through Monday. Recent clients include: Barbara Jackson, Ed. Service District #189, 330 Pacific Place, Mt. Vernon, Washington 98273 (workshop on public involvement); Rick Van Hermet, ISSA, P.O.Box 1837, Boise, Idaho 87301 (workshop presentation).

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 52**

VT WINOOSKI INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Anne M. Woolfson
St. Michael's College
Winooski, Vermont 05404 (802) 655-2000

Ann M. Woolfson has been a teacher-trainer and program developer in bilingual education since 1974. She was Director of Project Viable: an undergraduate teacher-training program in Bilingual Education at the University of Vermont. She is currently Director of the Tri-State Bilingual Parent Training Program at St. Michael's College. This program works with the State Department of Education to provide training services to parents from minority groups in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, provider of technical assistance, consulting help.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization effectiveness, school/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, project planning, fundraising/proposal writing, project evaluation, school curriculum assessment, administrative practices.

She is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, no travel or scheduling limitations. Recent clients include: Evaluation Dissemination and Assessment Center, Lesley College, 49 Washington Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140 (presentor, regional conference: "Defining, Organizing and Managing Parental Involvement"); Highgate-Sheldon Home-School Club of Highgate Center, Vermont 05459 (speaker: "Community-School Partnerships: Parents' Involvement in Education").

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 53**

VA CHARLOTTESVILLE COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER

Larry E. Decker
Mid Atlantic Center for Community Education
405 Emmet Street, Ruffner 217
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903 (804) 924-0866

Larry Decker has had over 15 years of professional experience in community involvement in education. He is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Administration and Supervision at the University of Virginia, and Director of the Mid Atlantic Center for Community Education. He is also the executive secretary of the Virginia Community Education Association. He has published over 25 articles and ten books and monographs on community education and community service.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops, provider of technical assistance, help.	School/community relations, parent involvement, use of community resources, school-business partnerships, advisory council consulting functioning, project planning, fundraising and proposal writing, school volunteers.

He is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, not applicable if in Virginia. No travel limitations, no scheduling limitations at present. Recent clients include: Albermarle County Public Schools, Virginia (School Volunteer Committee 1981-83; Chapter II Committee 1983); United States Dept. of Education, Office for Bilingual Education Capacity Building, Panel 1983.

C4: RESOURCES: PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 54**

WA SEATTLE CITIZEN ACTIVIST

Susan Austin
Citizen's Education Center Northwest
105 South Main Street
Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 624-9955

Susan Austin is a coordinator for Project ACCESS (A Community Cooperating for Effective Seattle Schools). She has worked at the building and central office level on the process and issues of school-based management, on designing innovative ways to expand citizen involvement in school improvement activities, and on developing profiles for school planning and for expanding school use of community resources.

Field Services:	Topic of Speciality:
Speaker, panelist, trainer, organizer and conductor of workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting, documentor and evaluator of programs and projects.	Organizing parents and citizens, community organization effectiveness, parent involvement, use of community resources, advisory council functioning, project planning, needs assessment, group process, school volunteers.

She will provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, civic and community groups. Fees are negotiable, no limitations on travel or on scheduling. Recent clients include: Mr. B. Nelson, Supt., Seattle Public Schools, 815 Fourth Avenue North, Seattle, Washington 98195, and Betty Jane Narver, Institute for Public Policy and Management, University of Washington, Seattle.

C4: RESOURCES; PEOPLE **RESOURCE ABSTRACT NO. 55**

W. VA HUNTINGTON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER

Edward E. Gotts
Appalachian Educational Laboratory
1211 7th Street
Huntington, West Virginia 25701 (304) 529-0404
(304) 525-7801

Edward E. Gotts is currently principal investigator for the NIE-supported "Home-School Communications" project. He has given workshops, training sessions, and research presentations on home-school partnerships. He was Professor of Education at Indiana University, Bloomington, and Director of the Division of Childhood and Parenting of the Appalachian Educational Lab in Charleston, West Virginia.

Field Services:	Topics of Speciality:
Speaker, trainer, organizer and conductor workshops and conferences, provider of technical assistance, consulting help, documentor and evaluator of programs and projects.	School/community relations, parent involvement, project planning, of needs assessment, project evaluation, community surveys, research design, school program assessment, administrative practices, measuring pupil achievement, effective communications practices for the schools.

He is willing to provide services directly to citizens advisory council members, parents and parent organizations, and civic or community groups. Fees are negotiable, no travel limitations. Scheduling is flexible if planning is done in advance. Recent clients include: Ohio County Schools, Wheeling, West Virginia (trained staff, consulted with assistant Superintendent, school board members, consulted with principals); Community Education Office, Alabama SEA (helped provide workshops, wrote practitioner articles for State Dept. newsletter to all school personnel).

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

TOPICAL INDEX

As noted in the Introduction, it is this topical index which is the "key" to the contents of the Citizen's Notebook. It references the various individual items -- fact sheets, research briefs, abstracts of projects, organizations and resource people, by more than 45 topics.

Most of the topics are described in self-explanatory, technical and popular, terms that are common to discussions of education and schooling at all levels. A few of the terms, however, require some preliminary definition.

Some represent the rather special vocabulary that has grown out of the effective schools research and reform movement. For example:

"EXPECTATIONS" refers to both individual teacher expectations and to the cultural norm, at the level of a school or school system, which express the belief that all children are capable of minimum mastery of the basic skills.

"INSTITUTIONAL FOCUS" refers to the school's sense of mission expressed in the belief that its job is to teach all children, and to overcome the handicaps of class, and in practices which demonstrate a readiness to, if necessary, reallocate resources in order to accomplish that mission.

Another set of terms reflects our understanding that there are many kinds and levels of parent and citizen involvement. For example:

"ADVOCACY" refers to citizen action that is initiated by citizens themselves, which is designed to influence school policy either by raising new issues, supporting in the arena of public opinion or programs initiated by the schools, or by watchdogging the implementation of school programs (see "ADVOCACY: MONITORING"). In short, advocacy refers to outside-of-the-system, but not necessarily adversarial, citizen activities designed to influence school policy.

"DECISIONMAKING" refers to those inside-the-system collaborative activities in which citizens and parents are invited to participate in helping to make decisions about policy development and program implementation. Examples include: Sitting on goal-setting committees, study groups and task forces, and program advisory committees of various kinds.

"CO-PRODUCTION" refers to the kinds of activities in which citizens and parents contribute to the process of teaching and learning. Such contributions include at-home or in-school tutoring and volunteering to provide instructional and co-curricular support to professional teaching staff. Also included are activities through which parents become aware of the school's mission, expectations of pupils, and teaching services. In the latter case participants contribute to learning by reinforcing school expectations.

"HOME-SCHOOL COMMUNICATION" refers to a fourth category of family-school interaction. In this category, citizens and parents are not involved either in decisions about what and how to teach, or in producing teaching or learning. The reference is, instead, to informational contacts such as notes sent to the home, visits to the home by teachers, or to the school by parents, and frequent in-between report card period reporting of pupil progress, parent-teacher or parent-principal conferences. Research has shown that schools which engage in more of these kinds of communications also enjoy better pupil achievement.

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
ABILITY GROUPING	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 6
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 2, 4-5, 10, 15, 18, 29, 41
	Appendix B	(453)	Fact Sheet No. 16
ADVISORY COUNCILS	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 2, 5, 8, 10-12, 19, 23-29, 32-36, 36-39, 41, 43, 45-46
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-27, 29-30
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 1, 8
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1-2, 5-6, 8, 12-14, 17, 23, 28, 31, 34, 36, 37, 40-41, 47, 50-54
ADVOCACY: GENERAL	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 4, 42
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 1-10, 17-19, 23-24, 28, 30-31, 34-36, 41-43, 45-47
ADVOCACY: MONITORING	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 14, 20, 27, 29
ATTENDANCE	Part A	(11)	Research Brief No.'s 2, 32
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 14, 16
BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 11
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 30
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 16, 40
BUSINESS-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 11-12, 33

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
BUSINESS-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP (cont'd.)	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item 10
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1, 2, 6, 10-12, 18, 22-24, 45, 48-53
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION	see "PARTICIPATION"		
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	see "TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS"		
CLIMATE	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 1
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 1, 18, 34-35
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1-2, 6, 9-14, 23-24, 26, 29, 33, 36, 42, 44, 46
	Part C1	(255)	Reading List No. 6
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 3, 5-7, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 26-27, 29
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Abstract No.'s 2-4, 8, 10
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 6, 7, 13, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 27, 32, 34, 36, 44-45, 47, 50
	Appendix B	(453)	Fact Sheet No. 16
COMMUNITY EDUCATION	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 12
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1-2, 8, 24, 28, 37, 38
	Part C2	(261)	Entire section
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1, 6, 11, 20, 28, 43, 53

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	see "BUSINESS-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS," "COMMUNITY EDUCATION," "CO-PRODUCTION" and "UNIVERSITY-SCHOOL COLLABORATION"		
COMMUNITY SURVEYS	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 7-8, 34, 37, 41-42
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 4, 9, 12, 16, 22, 24, 27, 29, 50
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 4, 8
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1-2, 6, 11, 13, 16-17, 21-22, 27, 41, 43, 47, 55
COOPERATIVE LEARNING	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 2
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 4, 15, 35
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 4, 20
CO-PRODUCTION	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 3-4, 7, 23, 27
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 6, 13, 15-16, 19, 23, 25-29, 31, 34, 37-38, 41-46
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 1, 4, 6-8, 12-13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26-27, 29-30
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 1, 4, 11-12
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-24, 26, 31, 33-36, 41, 43, 45-55
	see also "HOME-SCHOOL COMMUNICATION," "PARENT EDUCATION," "TUTORING" and "VOLUNTEERING"		
CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 3, 5, 7, 14, 15, 17-18, 30, 45, 47

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT (continued)	see also "INSTITUTIONAL FOCUS"		
DECISIONMAKING	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 1, 22, 27, 40
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1-3, 5, 8, 10-12, 19, 23-26, 28, 32-33, 36-37, 39, 41-43, 45
DIRECT INSTRUCTION	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 3
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 10, 33, 35
DISCIPLINE	see "CLIMATE"		
EVALUATION OF SCHOOL PROGRAM	Part B	(157)	Practice Profile No. 29
	Part C1	(255)	Reading List No.'s 5 and 6
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Items 2-7, 9, 14, 19-23, 25-27, 30
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 2, 4-5, 7, 9, 10
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1, 6, 11, 13, 15-16, 21-22, 25-27, 33, 39, 47, 55
EXPECTATIONS	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 4
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 2, 8, 11-12, 18, 22, 25-26, 34, 39, 41
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 9-15, 18, 21-22, 24-26, 28-29, 31, 33, 35-36, 39, 44, 45-47

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
EXPECTATIONS (cont'd.)	Appendix B	(453)	Fact Sheet No. 16
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 18
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 6, 18, 19, 25, 41
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 3
INSERVICE TRAINING	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 13, 23
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 5, 13, 16, 22, 32-33, 36-37, 40, 43
INSTITUTIONAL FOCUS	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 9
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 2, 8, 12, 13, 25, 34, 41
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 2, 3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-15, 17, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 44-45, 47
	Appendix B	(453)	Fact Sheet No. 16
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No.'s 8 and 10
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 1-2, 8, 10, 12-14, 19, 22, 31-32, 41
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 10-14, 16-18, 21, 24-26, 29, 32-33, 35, 41-42, 44, 46
	Part C1	(255)	Reading List No. 6
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 5-6, 11, 14, 15, 18, 23, 24, 26

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP (cont'd.)	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 4, 9, 10, 13
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 4, 12-14, 16-17, 21-23, 25-26, 29, 32, 36-38, 42, 45-47, 51-52, 55
	Appendix B	(453)	Fact Sheet No. 16
LESSON PLANS	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 11
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 13, 15, 45
MASTERY LEARNING	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 15 and 31
MONITORING PUPIL PROGRESS	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 12
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 10, 12, 26, 41
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 3, 9-12, 15, 17-18, 21, 24-26, 28, 31, 34, 40-41, 45
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 3, 10, 13
	Appendix A	(443)	Reading List No. 7
NEEDS ASSESSMENT	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 16, 26, 29, 36-37
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 2-9, 11-12, 16-19, 21-30
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 2-3, 8, 11, 13
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1, 6-7, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 36, 43, 47, 54

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
PARENT EDUCATION	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 7, 23, 27
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 23, 28
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, all items on Chart B
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 7 and 12
	Part C4	(311)	All Resource People Abstracts in C4
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	see "PARTICIPATION"		
PARTICIPATION: GENERAL	Part A2	(25)	Reading List No. 3
	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 1, 4, 7-8, 12, 18, 22-23 27
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 16, 19, 20, 23-29, 31, 34, 36, 39, 41-46
	Part C1	(255)	Reading List No. 5
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, all items on Chart B
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 1, 4-8, 11, 12
	Part C4	(311)	All Resource People Abstracts in Part C4
	Appendix A	(443)	Reading List No. 7
PRINCIPALS	see "INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP'		

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
SMALL VS. WHOLE GROUP INSTRUCTION	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 6
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 6, 16, 26, 32
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 19
TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS	see "ABILITY GROUPING," "BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES," "EXPECTATIONS," "IN-SERVICE," "INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION," "LESSON PLANS," "SMALL VS. WHOLE GROUP INSTRUCTION," and "TIME-ON-TASK"		
TEACHER PRAISE AND FEEDBACK	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 4, 6, 9, 26, 34-35, 39
TESTING	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 12
	Part B	(157)	Practice Profile No.'s 15, 19, 34
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 15
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 15 and 29
	Appendix A	(443)	Reading List No. 7
	see also "MONITORING PUPIL PROGRESS"		
TIME-ON-TASK	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 15
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 2, 10-11, 17, 24-26, 32, 36-37
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 7, 9, 14, 16-17, 34, 38, 41, 46
	Part Cl	(255)	Reading List No. 5
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 3 and 13

TOPICAL INDEX

TOPIC	PART OF THE NOTEBOOK	(PAGE)	TYPE AND ITEM NUMBER
TRACKING	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 6
	Appendix B	(453)	Fact Sheet No. 16
TUTORING: AT HOME	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 6, 34, 37, 38, 43, 45
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 12
TUTORING: IN SCHOOL	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 4 and 27
	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 1, 13, 19
UNIVERSITY-SCHOOL COLLABORATION	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 4, 18, 20, 22-23, 37
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 5-7, 10, 13, 15-16, 20-23, 25, 28-29
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 5, 13, 16-17, 24-27, 29, 32, 29, 52
VOLUNTEERS	Part A3	(35)	Fact Sheet No. 13
	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No.'s 1, 13 and 19
	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item No.'s 2-13, 17-25, 28-30
	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 4
	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 1, 6, 10, 20, 22, 41, 43, 51, 54

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
AL	Montgomery	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #1
AR	Phoenix	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #2
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 1
CA	Beverly Hills	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 2
	Chula Vista	Part B	(157)	Project Profile No. 1
	Cupertino	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 3
	Encinatas	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 4
	Elk Grove	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 5
	La Jolla	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 6
	Los Angeles	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 1 and No. 41
		Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 2 - 4
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 7 - 8
	Milpitas	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 5
	Newport Beach	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 48
	Palo Alto	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 1
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 9
	San Diego	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 6 and 7
		Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #4
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 11 - 13
	San Francisco	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 49

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
CA	San Jose	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 9
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 14
		Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 50
	Santa Barbara	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #3
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 10
CO	Boulder Valley	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 7
CT	Hartford	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 10
	New Haven	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 2
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 16
	Storrs	Part C4	(311)	Resource Person Abstract No. 17
	Vernon	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 11
	West Haven	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 51
DE	Newark	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #5
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 45
FL	Gainesville	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #6
	Miami	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 12
GA	Atlanta	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 18 - 19
		Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 52
HI	Honolulu	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Items #7 and #8

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
HI	Honolulu	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 20
IL	Chicago	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 14 - 16
	Lake Forest	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 21 - 22
IN	Columbus	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 53
	Hammond	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 23
		Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 55
	Indianapolis	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Ttem #9
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 24
		Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 55
	Muncie	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #10
KS	Overland Park	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 25
ME	Auburn	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 17
	Farmington	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #29
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 28
MD	Baltimore	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 18
		Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #12
		Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 3
		Part C4	(311)	Resource Person Abstract No. 26
	College Park	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Ttem #12

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
MD	College Park	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 27
	Elkon	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 19
	Indian Head	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 20
	La Plata	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 56
	Rockville	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 20
MA	Boston	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 29 - 30
	Cambridge	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 22
	Chelmsford	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 4
	Waban	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 31
MI	Benton Harbor	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 23
	Detroit	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 57
	East Lansing	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 32
	Flint	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 24
		Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #14
	Holland	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 58
	Marquette	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 25
	Plattsburg	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 59
	Wayne	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 33
	Ypsilanti	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #15
MS	Hattiesburg	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #16

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
MO	Kansas City	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 41
	St. Louis	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 26
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 35
MT	Helena	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #17
NE	Lincoln	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 36
NJ	Newark	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 2
	Paterson	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 27
	Sewall	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #18
	Trenton	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 5
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 37
NY	Bayside	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 38
	Ithaca	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 39
	Kenmore	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 28
	Long Island City	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 6
	New York City	Part A4	(73)	Research Brief No. 41
		Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 29 - 32
		Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 7
		Part C4	(311)	Resource Organization Abstract No.'s 40 - 42
OK	Stillwater	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #20

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
OH	Centerville	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 45
	Cleveland	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 46
	Dayton	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 33
		Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 8
OR	Eugene	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 9
	West Linn	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 34
NC	Boone	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #19
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 43
	Carrboro	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 44
PA	Philadelphia	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 10
SC	Columbia	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No.'s 35 - 36
		Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #21
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 47
SD	Vermillion	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #22
TN	Nashville	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #23
TX	Austin	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #24
		Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 11
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 48
	College Station	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 37

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
TX	College Station	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #25
	Stephanville	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 49
	Silsbee	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 37
		Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #26
UT	Salt Lake City	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 39
		Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #27
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No.'s 50 - 51
VT	Winowski	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 52
VA	Alexandria	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 12
	Arlington	Part C3	(283)	Resource Organization Abstract No. 13
	Blacksburg	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #28
	Charlottesville	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 40
		Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #29
		Part C4	(311)	Resource Abstract No. 53
WA	Battle Ground	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 41
	Mercer Island	Appendix B	(453)	Practices Profile No. 60
	Olympia	Part C2	(261)	Community Education, Chart B, Item #30
	Seattle	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 42
		Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 54
	Selah	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 43

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

STATE	LOCALITY	NOTEBOOK PART	(PAGE)	TYPE AND NUMBER OF ITEM
WA	Snohomish	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 44
WV	Huntington	Part C4	(311)	Resource People Abstract No. 55
WI	Milwaukee	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 46
	Wauwatosa	Part B	(157)	Practices Profile No. 47

APPENDIX A

HOW TO MEASURE YOUR SCHOOL'S EFFECTIVENESS

By Karl Clauset and Judith Frederick

INTRODUCTION

Your children's school probably administers a standardized achievement test or a criterion-referenced test (see "A Note About Testing" on the next page) each year or every other year to all students in the school. This test data can be used to help assess your school's effectiveness as indicated by student performance.

Before determining what the test data tells you about your school's effectiveness, you need to ask, and answer, three questions:

(1) Which part of the test results will be used?
(2) How should the data be analyzed?
(3) Into what groups should the students be separated to compare test results?

The following sections present some suggestions for how to answer these three questions. The answers suggested are not the only possible ones, but represent both typical choices made by schools in the effective schools movement and procedures that are easy to follow. After these questions are answered, you can then easily group students and classify their test results.

Karl Clauset is a Research Associate at Boston University and a part-time Research Associate with IRE in areas of school effectiveness and computer-based information clearinghouses. His dissertation, completed in 1982, was entitled "Effective Schooling: A System Dynamics Policy Study," and won the award of outstanding dissertation from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in March 1983.

Judith Frederick, Principal of Hammond Elementary School, Wareham, MA, is currently a doctoral student at Boston University and is involved in a research project comparing different ways of measuring effective schools.

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

APPENDIX A

WHICH TEST RESULTS TO USE?

Suggestion: Reading Comprehension and Total Math

We know that reading and mathematics are important subjects. They are the first things we study in school and we continue to use them all our lives. Without an adequate foundation in reading and mathematics, we would learn very little in school. These skills are essential to do well in high school, college, and daily living. That is why we call them "basic skills."

Most schools in the effective schools movement have been concerned about the mastery of basic skills. The achievement test your school uses measures the achievement in a variety of subject areas, including the basic skills. The tests report scores on subtests (the different subjects) and a total score.

At the elementary level, a school's effectiveness is best measured by the reading comprehension score and the composite total math score. At the high school level, the sub-tests of reading comprehension and math computation and concepts would probably be most appropriate.

A NOTE ABOUT TESTING

Standardized Achievement Tests	Criterion Referenced Tests
Standardized achievement tests, such as the Iowa Test of Basic Skills or the Metropolitan Achievement Test, report test results that compare your child's performance with the performance of a reference group of other children from across the United States. These tests are often called "norm-referenced" tests. For example, if your child was placed in the 98th percentile on a test, this means that he or she did better on that test than 98% of the students in the reference group.	Criterion referenced tests, such as the Michigan Educacational Assessment Program (MEAP), report results that show how well your child has mastered specific objectives taught in the school. The test will have several questions on each objective. The percentage of questions answered correctly for an objective is an indication of the student's mastery of the objective.

HOW TO ANALYZE THE DATA

Suggestion: Compare Distribution of Scores for Different Groups of Students

Many schools have been concerned that within the school some

APPENDIX A

groups of students do much better than others. In urban areas, the fear has been that poor and/or minority children perform more poorly than other students. One can look for these differences by comparing the percentage of students in one group who achieve a certain level of performance with the percentage of students in another group achieving the same level. If one group is at a significantly lower level, then the school is not as effective for that group as it is for other groups of students.

With standardized achievement tests, one compares groups of students in the school against the national reference population. How one student compares with the reference population is expressed in the percentile score. You can compare two groups of students by counting the number of students in each percentile range.

FIGURE 1

Standardized Achievement Test
Reading Comprehension Sub-Test

Percentile Range Reading Comprehension	GROUP A Grade 3 total = 60 students		GROUP B Grade 3 total = 27 students	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
76 - 100	54	82%	20	74%
51 - 75	9	14%	6	22%
26 - 50	2	3%	1	4%
0 - 25	1	1%	0	0%

Figure 1 provides an example. There are 60 students in Group A and 27 students in Group B. This figure shows how the scores were distributed across four percentile ranges (0-25, 26-50, 51-75 and 76-100). From this chart, one can see that a greater percentage of Group A students scored in the top percentile range (76-100) than the Group B students, but that about the same proportion of students scored in the lowest categories (0-25 and 26-50). Breaking up the data like this reveals that the school is not as effective for Group B as it is for Group A. Parents and teachers should begin asking why these differences exist.

Onc can analyze the results of a criterion-referenced test in a similar fashion. For these tests, one is concerned with how well a given group of students in the school performs an objective or set of objectives as compared to other groups in the school. You can compare the two groups by counting the number of students in each mastery range. Figure 2 provides an example. There are four mastery ranges (0-25, 26-50, 51-75, 76-100). From this chart, one can see that Group B students have much lower mastery levels than Group A students -- only 28% of Group B students have mastered more than 50% of the reading objectives as compared to 80% of Group A students. Clearly, instruction is less effective for the students in Group B.

FIGURE 2

Criterion-Referenced Test
Reading Comprehension Objectives

Percent of Mastery	GROUP A Grade 5 total = 50 students		GROUP B Grade 5 total = 25 students	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
76 - 100	17	34%	4	16%
51 - 75	23	46%	3	12%
26 - 50	7	14%	12	48%
0 - 25	3	6%	6	24%

Remember that in analyzing your school's test data, differences of only a few percentage points don't mean much. You should be looking for patterns that show differential treatment among groups within the school or significant differences between your school's performance and most other elementary and secondary schools.

WHICH GROUPS TO COMPARE

Suggestion: Compare Groups Based On:

- race or ethnic background
- socio-economic status
- past achievement

The issue of whether or not schools are more effective for some students than for others is an important one. In terms of the instruction given, schools may discriminate among students and it may be done consciously or unconsciously. Comparing achievement scores among groups is a way to check for this discrimination.

APPENDIX A

At a given grade level, the three most prevalent ways of classifying students into groups have been by race or ethnic background, socio-economic status, and past achievement. For example, in Figure 1, Group A might be all the white students in Grade 3, and Group B all the minority students in Grade 3. In Figure 2, Group B might represent all poor students in Grade 5 and Group A all other students in Grade 5. Schools often use eligibility for free or reduced price school lunches as the criteria for deciding which students to classify as "poor". You might also group students according to sex, teacher, or other characteristics that you feel might lead to differences in instruction. Your choice should depend on the type of community the school serves.

The examples shown in Figures 1 and 2 provide "snap-shots" of how a school is doing this year. This type of analysis does not tell you whether your school is better (or worse) now than it was several years ago. To get a picture of how patterns of student achievement have changed, you need to compare the achievement scores of the same groups of students for several years in a row. The groups you compare can be based on race, socio-economic status, past achievement, or other criteria. Figure 3 is an example of this type of comparison, where students are grouped according to socio-economic status. Figure 4 is an example of students grouped according to past achievement.

FIGURE 3

Comparing Present and Past Performance of
Students Grouped According to Socio-Economic Status

Per-centile Range	GROUP I (free lunch) Gr. 4				GROUP II (other) Gr. 4			
	Results Now		Results Two Years Ago		Results Now		Results Two Years Ago	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
76-100								
51-75								
26-50								
0-25								

In Figure 3, Group I students are those students now in the fourth grade who receive free or reduced price lunches. Group II students are all other students in the fourth grade. The Results Now column represents the pattern of scores for the students on standardized achievement tests taken this year in the fourth grade.

APPENDIX A

This part of the chart is just like Figure 1. The columns labeled Results Two Years Ago are the test results for the same students when they were in the second grade two years ago. To complete these columns you need to check the school records for each student now in Group I and Group II to find out what their scores were two years ago.

If a student was not in the school two years ago, then the student's scores should not be included in the analysis.

Figure 4 illustrates how to compare students who are grouped according to past achievement. Group I represents the results now for students who were all in the top one-fourth of the students two years ago (76-100 percentile range). Group II represents all students in the 2nd one-fourth of students two years ago, and so on. If all of the Group I students score this year in the 76-100 percentile range, then you would only have numbers in the box marked with an "X" under Group I.

However, this is not likely to happen, for in each group it is likely that some students will do better and others worse than they did two years ago.

You will notice in Figure 4 a diagonal pattern of "X's". If for each group, most of the students cluster in the boxes marked with an "X", present scores for the group are the same as the scores two years ago. This means that the school discriminates in achievement. That is, students who did poorly in the past will do poorly in the future and students who did well in the past will do well in the future. The school does not help the low-achieving student do better. It is not effective for low-achievers.

FIGURE 4

Comparing Present and Past Performance of Students Grouped According to Past Performance

Results Now (percentile score)	Group I (top 1/4 of pupils 2 yrs. ago)		Group II (2nd 1/4 of pupils 2 yrs. ago)		Group III (3rd 1/4 of pupils 2 yrs. ago)		Group IV (4th 1/4 of pupils 2 yrs. ago)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
76-100	X							
51-75			X					
26-50					X			
0-25							X	

APPENDIX A

The type of analysis shown in Figures 3 and 4 enables you to see whether a particular group of students has improved over time and to see how the group compares with other groups. You might even want to compare test results over several time periods to get a more representative picture of your school's achievement patterns.

To summarize, you have now made some decisions about what tests to use, how to classify the data, and how to group students for comparison. The more difficult task is the interpretation of these results. If the data show differences among groups or differences between similar groups at different schools, one is inevitably drawn to ask, "*Why* do these differences exist? And what can we do to help reduce them?"

If analysis of achievement data show differences in performance between the school and other similar schools or among groups within the school, you may want to collect other information about your school to understand the problems more clearly. For example, you might ask, "What are the attitudes of students toward the school, themselves, and learning?" "What is the atmosphere of the school?" "What kind of expectations do teachers and administrators have for student achievement?" "How much communication is there between school and parents?"

Remember, student achievement scores on basic skills are but one indicator of your school's effectiveness.

School improvement begins with parents, teachers and administrators asking questions about their school and their students and seeking answers to these questions. Changes should be based on knowledge about the students, the school, and the community, and on what educators know about effective teaching and schooling. The purpose of this Appendix has been to help you to begin to ask and answer some important questions.

PARENTS' GUIDES TO UNDERSTANDING TESTS

Here are some materials which provide basic information on understanding test results. The list is selective and does not go into materials produced as a result of the debates over norm vs. criterion-referenced tests, test bias, or other arguments over minimum competency. Although not all of the listed materials are available commercially or in public libraries, all are relatively short and are available from ERIC.

(1) DYER, H.S. (1980). Parents Can Understand Testing. Available from the National Committee for Citizens in Education, Suite 410, Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, MD 21044.

(2) HERNDON, E.B. (1981). Your Child and Testing (Revised). National Institute for Education. Available from ERIC. ED 120 576.

(3) Parents' Guide to Standardized Aptitude and Achievement Testing (1978). National School Public Relations Association, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, VA. Stock No. 411-13389.

(4) Parents' Guide to Understanding Tests. McGraw-Hill, Montery, CA, 1976. Available from ERIC, ED 179 551.

(5) STIGGENS, R.J. (1980). A Parents' Guide to Testing in the Schools. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Available from ERIC, ED 196 934.

(6) WARD, J.G. and J.C. GOULD (1980). Plain Talk About Standardized Tests. American Federation of Teachers. Available from ERIC, ED 206 721.

(7) Interpreting and Using Test Results: School Advisory Council Guides. School Advisory Council Assistance Project, College of Education, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208.

CAN THE SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH APPLY TO THE HIGH SCHOOL?

For reasons stated in the "Introduction," we focused our attention on the elementary level. Nonetheless, in the course of our survey of the literature, we came across a handful of studies -- see Research Brief No.'s 42 through 48, below, which explored to what extent the conclusions of the school effectiveness research do apply to the high school. Together, these studies provide research clues for the questions:

- Are the same factors responsible for effectiveness at the elementary and secondary level? If not, why not?
- What is it that makes high schools different?
- And, finally, what does work at the high school level?

Coleman's (1980) study* (see Crain and Ferrer, 1982) found that private high schools were more effective (in terms of average student achievement) than public high schools, and that the more effective private schools exhibited conditions much like those described by the five correlates of effective schools: instructional leadership; expectations; orderly climate; focus on basic skills; and frequent monitoring of pupil progress.

But Crain and Ferner's (1982) exhaustive secondary analysis of Coleman's data suggests that this conclusion may be premature, because the statistical claim that private schools are more effective is shaky, if one controls more precisely for pupil characteristics. That is, private schools draw more from a select pool of students.

Furthermore, Firestone and Herriot's (1982) comparison of elementary and high schools suggests that there are important structural differences between the two and that as a result the effective schools factors either do not apply or would look very different at the high school level. This analysis is pursued in Firestone and Herriot (1982, and in Pressesien (1982). From those two studies and from Brookover (1981), Ascher (1982), and Schmidt (1981), we begin to get some clues as to what "works" and "what applies" to the high school. These clues are summarized in chart form on the next pages.

---

* James Coleman, et al. (1981), Public and Private Schools. National Center for Education Statistics. (NCES 82-230). Contract No. OE-300-78-0208.

FACT SHEET NO. 16: CAN THE SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH APPLY TO THE HIGH SCHOOL?

FACTOR AND PRACTICE	FINDINGS AND/OR LIMITING CONDITIONS SPECIAL TO THE HIGH SCHOOL	REFERENCE
Instructional Leadership	High schools are departmentalized. Principals come from specialized backgrounds. Teachers are more likely to see the department chairperson, rather than the principal, as instructional leader.	Firestone and Herriott (1982)
School Climate	As is the case with elementary schools, an orderly atmosphere is necessary for academic success, with clearly defined rules enforced fairly.	Ascher (1982)
	Elementary schools are more likely than high schools to have formal policies on conduct and order. At the high school, such policies are more informal and vary teacher by teacher.	Firestone and Herriott (1982)
	Student participation is a key element of school climate.	Presseisen (1982)
Expectations and Institutional Focus	What counts as "basic" skills is unclear at the high school with its differentiated curriculum and student	Firestone and Herriott (1980 and 1982); Pressesein (1982); Brookover (1981)
	Teachers in elementary schools have a much higher consensus on school goals...	Firestone and Herriott (1980)
	And are much more likely to subscribe to the "ideology" that all students can achieve minimum mastery of academics.	Brookover (1981)
Grouping; Tracking and Ability Grouping	Cohesive student grouping throughout the day, and over a year, decreases student alienation which impedes academic progress.	Ascher (1982)
	Tracking: Contributes to student alienation and low achievement.	Ascher (1982)

FACT SHEET NO. 16 (cont'd.):

FACTOR AND PRACTICE	FINDINGS AND/OR LIMITING CONDITIONS SPECIAL TO THE HIGH SCHOOL	REFERENCE
Grouping; Tracking and Ability Grouping (continued)	Tracking: Leads to higher achievement for high ability students.	Brookover (1981)
	Ability grouping also leads to higher success for high achieving students,	Brookover (1981)
Homework	Is associated with improved achievement if assigned regularly and graded, and not used as punishment.	Ascher (1982)
School Size	No evidence that this makes a difference.	Brookover (1981)
Grade Configuration	No evidence whether 3 or 4-year high schools are more instructionally effective.	Brookover (1981)
Pupil Characteristics	Heterogeneity: The greater the differences in socio-economic status among students the less effective a high school is likely to be.	Brookover (1981)

ASCHER, C. (1982). "Student Alienation, Student Behavior and the Urban Schools," ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, New York.

In this paper, Carol Ascher focuses on student alienation in urban high schools. Alienation is an important factor in determining achievement, but relatively little research has been done on it. Ascher surveys research on four types of settings: comprehensive high schools, desegretated comprehensive high schools, alternative schools and private schools. She discusses what factors, based on these research findings, are related to reduced alienation and subsequent higher achievement.

According to Ascher, the following factors are consistently cited as contributing to alienation:

- large student body
- crowding
- changing teachers/classes every period
- tracking
- discriminating testing and placement methods
- discipline practices that are perceived to be unfair
- busing, when it means students cannot participate fully in school activities
- lack of administrative support for integration

Alternative or private schools are less likely to have these problems than public comprehensive high schools, and therefore their students experience less alienation. Factors that contribute to decreased alienation are:

- cohesive student groupings throughout the day, and over a period of years
- homework that is regularly assigned, and marked according to high standards, but not used as punishment
- opportunities for students to form groups/coalitions to find ways to bridge differences in class or race
- clear, consistent rules and values -- enforced fairly
- partnerships between teachers and students on activities
- principals who believe in and have high expectations of teachers and students
- teachers who have good morale, self-esteem, and high expectations of students, and who trust their administrators and students

CRAIN, R.L. and R.L. FERRER (1982). Achievement Prediction with School Level Equations: A Non-technical Example Using the "Public and Private Schools" Data. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Are private schools more effective than public schools in raising achievement levels? Robert Crain and Robert Ferrer reanalyze data from Coleman, et al.'s (1980) study comparing the effectiveness of public schools and private schools. In his report entitled Public and Private Schools, which surveyed 30,000 sophomores in 1,002 high schools, Coleman concludes that private schools are significantly more effective than public schools in raising scores on vocabulary, reading, and mathematics achievement tests. Crain and Ferrer, in a study sponsored by the National Institute of Education, believe that methodological problems in Coleman's research lead to an overgenerous estimate of the effectiveness of private schools compared to public schools. They point out that Coleman does not take into consideration that private schools can screen and select their students while public schools cannot. Also, Crain and Ferrer believe that Coleman's data include measurement errors which tend to exaggerate the role of private schools in raising scores when actually this factor is more accurately correlated with the higher socio-economic status of private school students. Crain and Ferrer additionally point out that Coleman ignores the "contextual effect" of the pool of generally higher SES students in private schools.

This seems to imply that if public schools could serve mainly middle to upper middle class students, and could select who they serve (which they can't), public schools would be just as effective as private schools. This is not particularly useful information for parent/community activists.

BROOKOVER, W.B. (1981). Effective Secondary Schools. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Because of the relative scarcity of research on effective high schools, the author draws only tentative conclusions in this monograph which examines three interrelated elements that make up a school's total social learning environment: (1) ideology; (2) social structure; and (3) instructional practices.

Regarding ideology, Brookover states that the conviction that all students in the school can learn is essential. Different expectations for different groups of students within a school detracts from overall achievement. Teachers should feel that they can teach all of the students in their classrooms, without relying on sending troublesome students off to specialists. Students need to have high self-concepts and the feeling that they can succeed at schoolwork, a perception that is related to effective instructional practices.

Little research has been done on high school social structure. According to Brookover, there is no conclusive evidence about whether three or four year secondary schools are more effective, or whether the size of a school makes a difference once socioeconomic factors are taken into account. Brookover says that ability grouping and tracking do lead to higher achievement for some students, but not for the student body as whole. He concludes that the greater the differences in status among students, the less effective a school will be generally.

Most of the research on effective instructional practices are from studies of elementary schools, but Brookover believes these findings have implications for secondary schools as well. For example, clear objectives and a well-defined academic purpose are associated with school effectiveness. Structured or directed instruction is better than an open classroom approach. Brookover mentions studies which indicate that team rather than individual competition within a classroom enhances overall achievement. He also cites evidence that shows that indiscriminate teacher praise is more harmful than helpful, as it reinforces incorrect student answers. Finally, with respect to monitoring student progress, it is better to evaluate achievement by schools as a whole, rather than by individual classrooms.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL RESEARCH BRIEF NO. 45

FIRESTONE, W.A. and R.E. HERRIOT (1980). Images of the School: An Exploration of the Social Organization of Elementary, Junior High, and High Schools. Field Studies Component, Research and Evaluation Division, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.

Firestone and Herriot describe two types of school "images": schools as rational bureaucracies, and schools as natural systems, and then investigate whether there are differences between elementary, junior high and secondary schools in the type of organizational models or images they follow. Their research is based on a sample of 13 schools (four elementary, six junior high and middle, and three senior high). Each of these schools had a prior relationship with the authors' sponsoring organization, Research for Better Schools, Inc.

A bureaucratically organized school has the following characteristics: a high degree of goal consensus, centralized control, and a high degree of coordination between constituent parts. Natural systems, on the other hand, are more likely to have low goal consensus, less centralized control, and less coordination between constituent parts. The expectation of the researchers was that since senior high schools have larger, more diverse student populations, secondary schools would be most likely to have bureaucratic organizations. Surprisingly, their research shows that, in fact, elementary schools are more bureaucratic. Junior high and middle schools are somewhere in between.

Teachers in elementary schools have a much higher level of consensus on school "product" goals (basic skills, respect for authority, self-esteem, etc.) than either junior or senior high school teachers. Elementary school teachers also have a higher degree of consensus on many "system" goals (cost reduction, relations with Central Office, integration of students, etc.). Elementary schools are more likely to have formal policies on rule enforcement, and teachers have less autonomy in decisionmaking than junior or senior high teachers. Decisions made in meetings are more frequently implemented in elementary schools than in junior or senior high schools, indicating a higher level of coordination. Interestingly, in all cases, parent meetings rarely led to decisions that are actually implemented.

FIRESTONE, W. and R. HERRIOTT (1982). Effective Schools: Do Elementary Prescriptions Fit Secondary Schools? Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Most of the research that has been done on effective schools has focused on elementary schools. In this paper, Firestone and Herriott summarize the results of a study they conducted to determine whether the factors commonly associated with effective elementary schools apply to secondary schools.

In the course of the study, they visited a random sample of 50 schools in southeastern Pennsylvania. Twenty-seven schools were elementary, and 23 were secondary. At each school, they asked teachers to fill out a questionnaire detailing their perceptions of school climate and instructional leadership by the principal. In several areas, the researchers found significant differences between elementary and secondary teachers.

First, they found markedly less agreement among secondary teachers about the academic goals of their school than among elementary teachers. This contradicts one of the commonly cited characteristics of effectiveness, namely that there should be a shared sense of purpose by school staff. With regard to administrative leadership, secondary teachers were significantly less likely to view the principal as having (or needing to have) a role in day-to-day classroom management than were elementary teachers. This also contradicts a frequently held correlate of school effectiveness. On the other hand, there were not major differences between secondary and elementary teachers in their views on the role of principals in curricular and staffing decisions, and the frequency and quality of communication between administration and staff members.

The researchers believe that the structural differences between secondary schools and elementary schools cause these varying teacher perceptions. High schools are departmentalized by subject area, and teachers see themselves as specialists rather than generalists. Since high school principals also come from specialized backgrounds, most high school teachers look to their department chairperson for direct instructional guidance rather than to the principal. In addition, the size of most high school staffs is considerably larger than that of most elementary school staffs. This discourages direct teacher-principal interaction.

PRESSEISEN, B.Z. (1982). Understanding Adolescence: Issues and Implications for Effective Schools. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Much of the writing and research that has been done on effective schools has focused on elementary schools and young children. In this report, Barbara Presseisen considers the implications of the effective schools movement for adolescent schooling. Presseisen finds that some recommendations (made primarily with elementary schools in mind) are appropriate for high schools while others are not.

For a whole host of reasons, adolescents benefit more from opportunities to participate in decisionmaking rather than simply following the dictates of authority figures. They are at an age when peer relationships are a priority, and communication patterns with adults are changing. The role of the high school principal is therefore to foster social and intellectual exchange within the school community.

Teacher Expectations: Presseisen points out that just "working for grades" is not motivating for adolescents. Schools and teachers do, however, play an important role in reinforcing or contradicting a teenager's self-image.

School Climate: Research indicates that "supportiveness" is important at the high school level. If students have a meaningful part in the improvement efforts of a school, this affects school climate positively.

Institutional Focus: If basic skills are too narrowly defined, students are likely to become alienated and resentful. Cognitively, they are at a time in their lives when diversity and discussion in academic areas are important. Curricular content should be "relevant" in the same sense that it should be tied to larger community issues and should have some relation to students' career plans.

To make secondary schools more effective, Presseisen sees the need for changes in school structure and organization, curriculum, staff orientation, student orientation, and support services. Schools cannot be narrowly focused, but must incorporate social and intellectual components into the learning process, and must offer opportunities for communication and exchange of ideas.

SCHMIDT, W. (1981). The High School Curriculum: It Does Make A Difference. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). ED 213 093.

This paper looks at how the quantity of instruction in different subject areas effects achievement at the high school level. Based upon a nationally representative sample of 9,125 high school seniors, in 725 schools, the author compiles information on school and community characteristics, and the number of hours of potential instruction each senior received in math, English, the fine arts, foreign language, social studies, and science, over the last three years of schooling. Schools are categorized according to 12th grade enrollment size (small = less than 300 seniors, medium = between 300 and 599 seniors, and large = more than 600 seniors). The community characteristics which are identified are the percentage of minority students attending the school, and the relative wealth of the community, based on census data. The student characteristics which are used in the study are aptitude, sex, race, and socio-economic background.

The results suggest that quantity of schooling has a positive effect on achievement. The more achievement is school-related, the larger is the resulting effect of the quantity of schooling. This is especially true for mathematics. Quantity of schooling also has positive effects on achievement in science and English, though less clear effects are found with vocabulary and reading comprehension. The author notes that the number of hours of instruction in science, social studies, and English decreased as the size of schools increased, while the opposite was true of foreign languages, math, and fine arts. He concludes that larger schools are better able to offer more specialized courses.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 48

CA NEWPORT BEACH NEWPORT-MESA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Write for: Managing a Competency Based Curriculum and Assessment System to: Newport-Mesa Unified School District, Post Office Box 1368, Newport Beach, California 92663.

Newport-Mesa has had a 20-year commitment to maintaining a competency based system. Tests are used as a "prescription" for what goes on in the classroom. Teacher committees have put together test items which would measure mastery in 12 skill and knowledge areas. The district developed a system which provides information on each student's mastery of specific objectives. Parents are kept informed of each student's progress.

Newport-Mesa has an ongoing evaluation program. It is a three year process of in-depth evaluation. The school site council decides how much growth it expects the students to achieve. Pre-tests and post-tests reveal whether these goals have been met.

Harbor View High School teachers use the results of each student's and each class's pre-test of the district's learning objectives to set learning objectives for his or her own class. With the principal, teachers find which of the learning objectives students fall short on and agree on how much growth should be expected in the weak areas. At the same time, teachers agree to continue the pupil's present rate of progress in the other areas of the instructional program, which prevents exclusive concentration on the targeted objectives. Teachers held conferences with parents each fall to inform them of the goals they have set.

Participation Descriptors	Topic Descriptors
Advisory councils, home-school communication	Instructional leadership, monitoring pupil progress

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL   PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 49

CA   SAN FRANCISCO   BALBOA HIGH SCHOOL

BOSSONE, R.M. (1982). What Works in Urban Schools: Proceedings of the Conference of the University/ Urban Schools Task Force, pp. 13-32. ED 216 052.

Project Redesign, a five year plan to reform the San Francisco Public Schools was developed by the superintendent, and was approved in 1976. Balboa High School was considered a good example of the success of Project Redesign and was presented as such at the Conference of the University/Urban Schools in 1982.

Balboa High School was large, multi-ethnic and beset by vandalism and racial tension. In 1980, the new principal, Shirley Thornton, met with community members, staff and students. After reviewing the information she had gathered, she decided to do the following:

a. Improve the physical plant by adding more security personnel and making renovations

b. Improve school/community relations

c. Report truancy and cutting to parents more consistently.

The principal also took steps to hire personnel to reflect the ethnic makeup of the school. Each department head met with the principal to review curriculum and course offerings and department members. Teachers were assigned to one department rather than to three as before. A faculty and student handbooks were produced by the respective groups and a counseling manual was developed by a committee of counselors.

Basic skill learning was improved through computer-assisted instruction (CAI). In basic skills courses, subjects were divided into "strands." The individual working in the course moves independently through each strand and builds an individual diagnostic profile. The record of past performance is used to

Descriptors: Climate, monitoring pupil progress tailor each lesson to the student's needs and is constantly updated. A teacher can request three types of reports on a student's progress: a course report, a grouping report (so the teacher can group students with similar needs) and a gains report (to show individual and group progress). Students get private, "non-threatening" instruction and spend more time on task.

The bilingual program has added an intake center that assesses a student's proficiency and decides on proper grade placement. An attendance project with a bilingual component was started which uses direct, personal contact with parents.

The total drop in enrollment was reversed after 1981, suggesting that parents are choosing to transfer their children from private schools. The School District has gained support of parents and of all the city agencies that deal with youth. The mayor has commended the extensive inter-department coordination in a letter to the board.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 50

CA SAN JOSE EAST SIDE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dr. Reuben Trinidad
Principal
William C. Overfelt High School
1835 Cunningham Avenue
San Jose, California 95122 (408) 259-0540

Principal Reuben Trinidad began his program of school improvement in the summer of 1982, when he organized a clean-up and painting of the school building, with the help of 62 parents, 27 staff members and 17 students. A new gym floor was added and the science wing was renovated.

During the next school year vandalism was almost totally eliminated, and homework was increased in all classes. The principal spent much time in the classrooms, encouraged parents to see him in his office and made frequent visits to students' homes. One of the participating parents made a videotape of the school, which the principal used in a workshop on the school clean-up at the State Conference of the California Education Association. Lockers were eliminated at the school, which the principal claims encourages students to carry their books home.

In the 1982-83 school year, Overfelt received wide recognition for improved scores in testings. The school received a $20,000 grant as one of 50 high schools selected by the Ford Foundation's High School Recognition Program. The funds will be used to improve instruction at the high school.

Descriptors: Advisory committees, climate, co-production, instructional leadership

---

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 51

CT WEST HAVEN WEST HAVEN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dr. John E. Onofrio
Deputy Superintendent of Schools
West Haven Department of Education
25 Ogden Street
West Haven, Connecticut 06516 (203) 934-6631

In February of 1982, West Haven High School experienced what was termed "a rather serious act of violence" that led to the formation of an ad hoc committee to eliminate violence in West Haven schools. Shortly after, West Haven was invited by the State of Connecticut Department of Education to become involved in a school climate assessment project. This project resulted in a detailed "profile" of the school's organizational climate and leadership and communication patterns. This profile led the administration to initiate a number of substantive changes to establish a "safe and orderly" environment.

For more information on parent involvement, contact: Delilah Gomes, West Haven High School, Circle Street, West Haven, Connecticut 06516, (203) 932-5701 x. 28.

Descriptors: Climate

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 52

GA ATLANTA BOOKER T. WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

EDUCATION U.S.A. (January 24, 1983, p. 169). National School Public Relations Association, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

The "Paideia Proposal" was introduced in 1982 by Mortimer Adler and a panel of administrators. The proposal was given a "test run" that year in Booker T. Washington High School in Atlanta. The effect of this proposal is to eliminate electives and vocational study in classrooms. The central concept is the use of Socratic discussion. For 90 students, two-hour daily seminars are held, dealing with philosophy, literature, and jurisprudence. For the rest of the student body, a two-hour reading session using materials from the humanities is required.

The teachers for the seminars were enrolled, in an intensive inservice program, with personnel from the National Humanities Faculty in order to learn the use of the Socratic method. Socratic discussions, in which all seminar members are encouraged to ask questions, are recommended by Adler as a means to motivate students to develop skills in critical and creative thinking.

The students responded to the program with great enthusiasm. The enrollment, 90 in 1983, is expected to grow to 400 in 1984. "As fast as we can train teachers, we'll bring in blocks of students," the principal of Washington said.

Descriptors: Inservice

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 53

IN COLUMBUS BARTHOLOMEW CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL CORPORATION

Dr. Lawrence Heyerdahl
Superintendent
Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation
2650 Home Avenue
Columbus, Indiana 47201 (812) 376-4220

The Bartholomew School Improvement Project was begun in 1982, districtwide. Five secondary schools formed individual committees and drew up their own programs for improvement. Each committee was composed of five representatives from students, staff, parents and community. Each member then contacted five peers to elicit their ideas and reactions. Each committee used a participatory management approach. Administrators did not attend these initial meetings, so that a free exchange of ideas would be possible. Each group designed their own "Vision of Excellence" statement.

Parents were involved as volunteers as counselors and homeroom monitors. They also tutored students in basic skills. A study skills workshop was held for parents, to assist them in improving their children's education. At one of the schools there was proposed a parent-student exchange where parents were invited to substitute for their student for a day. One of the guiding principles for this project is that every participant in the act of educating youth is also a learner.

Descriptors: Advisory councils, co-production, climate, decisionmaking, tutoring, volunteers

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 54

IN HAMMOND SCHOOL CITY OF HAMMOND, INDIANA

Dr. Raymond J. Golarz
Supervisor of Attendance
Child Welfare and Discipline
5935 Hohman Avenue
Hammond, Indiana 46320 (219) 932-5700 x. 212

In October of 1983, in what became the Alternative Education/School Improvement Project, a Hammond team of parents, teachers and administrators from Spohr and Eggers schools, along with two central office administrators underwent a formal training session with Gary Phillips of the Kettering I/D/E/A Foundation. They were introduced to the "Shared Ownership Concept" of school improvement. The Hammond team had three objectives for the high school. The first was improving the overall attendance rate. The second was reducing the dropout rate, and the third was to increase the number of parents and community members involved in the school.

Activities included: A freshman orientation meeting a few days before school began at which there was a large turnout of parents; parent volunteers; and parents were given the opportunity to visit classes for a day.

A major emphasis was on improved student discipline and attendance. Shopkeepers near the school have noticed the change for the better in the students' conduct. Attendance has increased and there has been a dramatic reduction in academic failures. The number of students on the honor roll nearly doubled.

Descriptors: Attendance, co-production, home-school communication

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL **PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 55**

IN INDIANAPOLIS LAWRENCE NORTH HIGH SCHOOL

William McColly
Principal
North High School
7802 North Hague Road
Indianapolis, Indiana 46256 (317) 849-9455

The Lawrence North High School Improvement Program adopted a program called "Challenge Education" after a self-study was done to identify areas needing improvement in 1980. The school staff who had worked on the study agreed that the use of participatory management techniques for decisionmaking would be efficacious and that extensive parent involvement would be needed. The participatory management approach involved a volunteer planning committee, made up of representatives of several school departments, five parents, five students representing all grade levels, the principal and the school district secondary curriculum coordinator. They formulated their goals, which included having parents, students and the school work as partners and active participants in education.

A Parenting Committee was formed, which worked to form a system of homeroom parents. In this plan, one parent of a student in each homeroom was responsible for building a bridge of communication between the homeroom teacher and the parents of all students in the homeroom. Through a "telephone tree," every parent of every student in the homeroom could be reached quickly. There was also instituted an annual "Parent Switch Day" in which ninth graders and their parents could change places at school for a day. A volunteer parent coordinator, selected by the Parenting Committee, coordinated parent volunteers who serve as tutors in special education classes, library assistants, and assistants to teachers/advisors.

The teacher/advisor program is a long-range project, in which designated teacher/advisors, classroom teachers, work with students singly and in small groups to help them develop life

Descriptors: Advisory councils, co-production, decisionmaking, tutoring, volunteers

skills. Teacher/advisors also function as a liaison with parents.

The "Challenge Education" program is aimed at introducing building-level change in small increments to insure early success. Staff members and parents are learning new skills and becoming part of the participatory process. As of 1982, student attendance had risen to 96% daily and the incidence of vandalism had dropped to zero. The voluntary inservice staff committee had gained more members, indicating that teachers can produce effective staff development programs without the use of outside consultants.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 56

MD LA PLATA CHARLES COUNTY SCHOOLS

Sally Grainger
Pupil Personnel Worker
Board of Education of Charles County
Post Office Box D
La Plata, Marylabnd 29646 (301) 932-6610 x. 484

Project FOCUS, begun in September 1981, in three secondary schools, was aimed at students who have average ability but who cannot achieve because of poor attendance, lack of motivation, or basic skills deficiencies. The goals were to improve attendance, decrease suspensions, and raise G.P.A.s. Project FOCUS is a teacher-based program in which teachers receive inservice training and manage the program. It is an alternative educational management plan which has been installed in two middle schools and at one alternative school. FOCUS is a non-academic program where the students meet every day. Each FOCUS group has 9 - 12 students. The project is based on inservice for teachers, existing school instructional staff and the appropriate selection of students.

Parents proposed the need for the project. During the year, parents are contacted frequently by FOCUS staff or by school administrators about their child's progress.

To measure the program's effectiveness, these areas are assessed: academics, attendance and behavior. At the Matthew Henson School, the Project FOCUS group showed improved attendance, higher G.P.A.s, and a lowered number of unsatisfactory ratings were given.

Descriptors: Attendance, advocacy, home-school communication

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 57

MI DETROIT DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Deborah Pugh
Director
High School Improvement Project
Detroit Public Schools
5057 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202 (313) 494-1923

In the fall of 1980, the Detroit Public Schools established a High School Improvement Task Force to address the issue of improving the academic performance of high school students. So, the High School Improvement Project was born.

Its purpose was to develop and implement a comprehensive improvement plan in each of eight high schools in order to improve achievement in English, social studies, mathematics and science, concentrating initially on 9th graders.

Each school selected a local planning team which included the principal, teachers, parents and students and these teams developed their own improvement plans. (Support was available from the central and regional staff as well as from consultants for the county school district and Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching.) Specific goals in the school plans included: increased student achievement in reading, mathematics, social studies and science; reduction of student drop-out rate; improved attendance; increased utilization of school resources and support services; improved counselor and teacher skills and services; improved principal and department head leadership skills; and improved school environment. The project focused their strategies in four areas: administrators' leadership, instructional program, guidance/orientation, feeder school articulation, and services and supports to students and parents.

The project will run through 1985 and has received grants of $400,069 and $730,300 from the Ford Foundation.

Descriptors: Advisory councils, climate, decisionmaking, instructional leadership

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 58

MI HOLLAND

HOLLAND HIGH SCHOOL
600 Van Ralte Avenue
Holland, Michigan 49423

EDUCATION U.S.A. (September 26, 1983), p. 29. National School Public Relations Associations, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

Alice Beukema, principal of Holland High School, began Project PA3S in 1983, to help students examine their reasons for failure and to encourage them to change these factors. Students who had failed more than one course the previous semester were directed to attend after school sessions once a week for three weeks. Led by Beukema or the assistant principal, discussions were held on the cause of failure, how students feel about it, and how to improve study habits. The program deemphasizes punishment, focusing instead on taking responsibility for oneself. The students responded enthusiastically, and some requested that the sessions contniue. The same approach is now being used to help entering sophomores.

Descriptors: Expectations, time-on-task.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 59

MO PLATTSBURG PLATTSBURG R-III SCHOOL DISTRICT

James W. Raulsten
Superintendent
Plattsburg R-III School District
800 Frost
Plattsburg, Missouri 64477 (816) 539-2183

The Plattsburg High School Improvement Plan was begun in 1982 in two schools. The Board of Education enlisted the aid of consultants from I/D/E/A to plan and conduct a seminar. The principle objectives were to identify needs of the community and to assure that long-range district plans were consistent with these needs. A committee was formed of faculty, administrators and parents, and two planning teams were formed for high school and elementary school improvement.

The committee decided on their criteria for effective secondary school systems: Community pride in the schools, well-organized classrooms, and teachers who are able to motivate students. The committee then developed a list of nine principles that would encompass their ideals. Among these were the concepts that the school should be a resource coordinator and that school and community values should be included in the curriculum. Parents must also share in the planning of and accountability for their children's education.

The committee established a three-stage process to reach consensus and agree on priorities. Subcommittees would meet to discuss program proposals and representatives from each met to select a common set of programs that could be adopted by the committee as a whole. Programs which satisfied the greatest number of principles could then be identified and program priorities established. Task groups selected from committee members would then evaluate programs.

At the present time, the committee is working to develop a five-year plan for implementing the programs that have been identified and prioritized. Among these programs are:

Descriptors: Advisory councils, community surveys, individualized instruction, needs assessment

from A CITIZEN'S NOTEBOOK ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS by the Institute for Responsive Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, (617) 353-3309. Made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

(a) Public Relations Program. Include administrators, parents, faculty and students in a formal public relations process.

(b) Planned activities such as peer tutoring and peer counseling.

(c) The development of a formal program for a curriculum which includes community values.

(d) A program that matches each student with a faculty or staff advisor who, together with the student and parent, would develop a personal educational development plan. Advisor-student-parent linkages would be maintained through the high school grades.

APPENDIX B: THE EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL PRACTICES PROFILE NO. 60

WA MERCER ISLAND MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT

Joan Simantel
Project Coordinator
Mercer Island School District
4160 86th Avenue S.E.
Mercer Island, Washington 98040 (206) 233-3332

The Mercer Island School Improvement Plan entered the planning stage in 1982. The Mercer Island Planning Committee was composed of 20 people, including teachers, administrators, community members and students. They have studied Japanese management techniques and have decided on definite ways it can be applied to improving the five schools in the district.

The planning process included extensive surveys of the community, students and staff. These documented declining enrollment, low staff morale, and poor school climate. The school district, in cooperation with the Washington Education Association, has decided to change their management orientation and structures.

The projects in the next three years, plans to improve communication between the schools and the community and create procedures for building level management by staff, parents and students. Each school will have an action plan which incorporates the Japanese management principle, "people support what they create."

Descriptors: Advisory councils, climate, community surveys, decisionmaking

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE FOR RESPONSIVE EDUCATION (IRE)

The Institute for Responsive Education (IRE) is a private, non-profit national research, policy analysis and technical assistance organization with a ten-year history of conducting studies and disseminating information about citizen participation in educational decisionmaking and other aspects of school-community relations. Although private and independent, the organization is housed in the School of Education at Boston University, where its President and founder, Don Davies, formerly Deputy U.S. Commissioner of Education, is a professor of education.

Founded on the premises that citizen participation is an essential ingredient in school improvement and that citizens' access to information is indispensable for effective participation, IRE has produced more than 30 reports, handbooks, bibliographies and other publications.

A list of publications, which like this *Notebook* are focused on community involvement in school improvement, is appended.

CURRENT PROGRAMS (1983-1984)

Citizen Participation in School Improvement

This is the effort which produced this *Notebook*. Since 1977, IRE has had the support of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation to work with state citizen organizations in California (IPEN -- Information Project on Education: Network), Florida (Florida Education Council), and South Carolina (Citizens Coalition for South Carolina Schools) to study and support school improvement through local school advisory councils. In March 1982, an invitational national conference was held in St. Louis on the theme, "Citizen Participation in School Improvement." A second national conference is scheduled for Spring 1985, as a culmination of this current project producing this *Notebook*.

Parents as Educators: Home-School-Community Partnerships for Learning

IRE has joined with the School of Education of Boston University to initiate in the fall of 1984 a regional New England program to develop and apply the concept of co-production -- parents and others in the community as partners with the schools in producing learning. The program will include field services and studies in selected cooperating school districts, research, the development of materials, and workshops and graduate courses. The scope of the program includes peer tutoring and counseling, parent education, school volunteers, use of community resources for student learning, and parent involvement in instruction of their own children. Recent IRE publications are: *Home-School Connection: Selected*

Partnership Programs in Large Cities (1983), For Every School A Community: Expanding Environments for Learning (1983), and A Two-Way Street: Home-School Cooperation in Curriculum Decisionmaking (1980), and a wide variety of reports and manuals on youth tutoring and peer counseling.

Political Leadership in an Era of Fiscal Retrenchment

During 1981-1983, IRE conducted a study under contract to the National Institute of Education of school district responses to declining enrollments and fiscal resources. The findings will be used as the basis for work in cooperating districts in which school officials and citizen leaders seek to develop political skills needed to minimize and manage conflict, maintain the integrity of the curriculum, and maintain equity of opportunity. Publications include: Managing Decline in Schools: A Handbook (1983), A Review of the Literature and an Annotated Bibliography on Managing Decline in School Systems (1982), and School Boards and the Communities They Represent (1984).

INFORMATION SERVICES

IRE has joined a consortium with the National School Volunteer Program (NSVP) and the National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) to study the feasibility of initiating a comprehensive national clearinghouse for parents and other citizens involved in school affairs. The planning project is supported by the MacArthur Foundation.

IRE maintains an ongoing clearinghouse which contains materials on about 250 topics about school-community relations.

Twice a year, IRE publishes Citizen Action in Education, a 16-page journal with a mailing list of about 50,000, which reports on programs, research, resources and developments in parent/citizen participation.

FIELD SERVICES

IRE provides, on a contract basis, services to school districts community organizations, state and Federal agencies, foundations and research institutes, which include: evaluation and documentation, consulting and technical assistance, workshops, and publications and dissemination. Three current field service activities are: (1) a contract with the Center for Early Adolescence at the University of North Carolina, for documenting and disseminating information about a project in California, Ohio and South Carolina to involve parents in the assessment of middle school programs, using the Center's assessment guides and materials; (2) a contract with the Greater Lowell (Massachusetts) Vocational Technical School District to evaluate a project to increase the involvement in school affairs of parents of bilingual high school students. The project involves training large numbers of parents to better understand the cultural and educational realities of American schools and communities; and (3) a contract with the Florida Education Council to produce reports for parents on citizens in a variety of current educational topics.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

IRE's work is supported by grants and contracts from foundations and government agencies, private contributions, sales of publications and payments for field services. Government sources of support include: U.S. Department of Education, Massachusetts Department of Education, and the National Teacher Corps. Support from foundations and corporations include: Edna McConnell Clark, Digital Equipment, Ford, W.T. Grant, Edward Hazen, Lillia Babbitt Hyde, McDonalds, New World and Rockefeller Family Fund, and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

OTHER IRE PUBLICATIONS ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

WHEN A COLLEGE WORKS WITH A PUBLIC SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATION, by Sidney Trubowitz, with contributions from Seymour Sarason, William Fibkins, Joanna Duncan and Paul Longo. 1984, approx. 220 pp., IRE and Queens College, ISBN 0-917754-23-9.

Details the history of the Louis Armstrong Middle School (Queens, NY) and Queens College collaboration, one of the most successful school-college cooperative ventures in the nation. First-hand accounts by some of the major participants in the collaboration.

ORDER NUMBER 20C	$8.50

FOR EVERY SCHOOL A COMMUNITY: EXPANDING ENVIRONMENTS FOR LEARNING, by Robert Sinclair, editor, Ralph Tyler, Ward Ghory, Sharon Kagan, Carol Schraft, Mario Fantini and Don Davies. 1983, 85 pp., IRE, ISBN 0-917754-20-4.

The authors examine the history of school-community interrelations, what responsibilities can be shared by institutions other than the schools, contexts for developing parent commitment to public education in the 1980's, means to link the school and community in the educative process, and directions to take in planning to foster school-community collaboration.

ORDER NUMBER 17C	$6.00

THE HOME-SCHOOL CONNECTION: SELECTED PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS IN LARGE CITIES, by Oliver Moles, Carter Collins and Mary Cross. 1982, 159 pp., IRE, ISBN 0-917754-18-2.

Contains reports by the National Institute of Education on 28 school-initiated programs in 24 large city school systems which explore forms of home-school collaboration at the elementary and secondary levels which may improve student learning, profiles of the 28 programs, site visit reports on seven, and notes toward a comprehensive home-school program.

ORDER NO. 15C	$8.00

A TWO-WAY STREET: HOME-SCHOOL COOPERATION IN CURRICULUM DECISION-MAKING, by Robert Sinclair, editor, Ralph Tyler, Mario Fantini, Ward Ghory, Sara Lightfoot, and Don Davies. 1980, 92 pp., IRE, ISBN 0-917754-16-6.

The authors examine the influence of parent involvement on academic achievement, ways parents and teachers can work together in making curriculum decisions, and the effects of hostility and tension often characterizing family school relations.

ORDER NO. 13C	$6.00

MEASURING SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS: A SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE, by Karl Clauset and Alan Gaynor. 1983, 18. pp.

An examination of the definition, causes, variables, and strategies of implementation suggests the kinds of data necessary for measuring school effectiveness. Based on a model of circular causality in schools, the authors emphasize the need for research on the organizational dynamics of implementing school effectiveness programs.

ORDER NO. 6P $ 2.75

ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENTS: A SYSTEM DYNAMICS PERSPECTIVE, by Karl Clauset and Alan K. Gaynor. 1983, 24 pp.

This paper argues that distinctions between organizations and their environments are not objective givens, but hypothetical formulations. This concept is illustrated by a model of the math-science teacher shortage. Two sectors, each of which is traditionally viewed as "the environment" of the other, are shown as integral parts of a single functional system.

ORDER NO. 7P $2.75

To Order

Return This Form and Payment To:

Institute for Responsive Education
Publications Department
605 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Name ______________________

Organization ______________________

Street ______________________

City__________ __________State________Zip______

All orders must be prepaid by check or money order, or accompanied by an official purchase order. All orders not prepaid will be billed for fourth class postage and $.50 for handling. Orders for at least ten copies of one publication will receive a 10% discount. As non-profit organizations, we cannot accept returns or issue refunds.

Order Number	Title	Quantity	Cost

TOTAL ______________

Payment is enclosed ________

Please bill me ________